United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 3, 2000 No. 39

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Almighty and eternal God, there is no limit to what You are able to do through people who are unreservedly dedicated to You, who humbly trust You, who are open to Your guidance, and who give You all the glory for what they accomplish. We begin this new week asking You so to draw our hearts to You, so to guide our minds, so to fill our imaginations, so to control our wills that we will truly belong to You and become responsive to Your Spirit. We spread out before You the challenges of this day and ask that You will use us for Your plans and Your purpose.

Bless the Senators. Replenish their strength, renew their sense of calling to serve You here, and rekindle their enthusiasm for doing Your will in all the issues of public policy. May they, and all of us who work with them, abandon ourselves to You. We place our lives in Your strong, capable hands for You are our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable CHUCK HAGEL, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business throughout the day with time under the control of Senator BOB SMITH, Senator BROWNBACK or his designee, Senator CRAIG or his designee, and Senator DURBIN or his designee. As previously announced, no votes will occur during today's session of the Senate. However, the Senate will begin consideration of the budget resolution at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday morning, and votes can be expected during each day and evening throughout the week.

The budget resolution is allowed up to 50 hours of debate, and quite often we have a series of votes at the end of that time. I hope we will not get into a long list of amendments that will require votes right at the very end. It is not a very good way to do business. Last year, after a lot of hard work by Senator REID and others, we were able to reduce that list to at least a reasonable number. But Senators should be on notice that we will have to spend a good bit of time in session on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, probably going into the night at least Wednesday and Thursday, and that there is a very good chance we will be in on Friday with votes.

If we can complete the budget resolution Thursday night, even if it means going late into the night, we will do that; otherwise, we will go into Friday. But we will complete the budget resolution this week so we can move forward with appropriations bills in the appropriations subcommittees beginning next week.

Members should also be aware there are a number of important committee markups that will be occurring this week. So we are going to have a very busy time.

THE FIRST TARTAN DAY

Mr. President, I should note this is also the first week in history that we will recognize those of us with Scottish heritage: Thursday, April 6, will be the first Tartan Day. I understand the head of the Church of Scotland will be here, as well as a number of visiting members of the Scottish Parliament.

I look forward to the opportunity to wear my kilt and wear a bit of the tartan on Tartan Day. I ask all my colleagues to look through their Scottish ancestry and find their tartan tie or something with which they can mark their appreciation for the impact that Scotland has had on our history. In fact, about half, maybe a little more than half of the signers of the Declaration of Independence actually had Scottish ancestry. So I am glad we will have this day to recognize that, and I look forward to joining our Chaplain, Lloyd John Ogilvie, as we celebrate this occasion.

A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will spend some time this week giving serious thought to how we should proceed on the development of a national energy policy and what we could do on a short-term basis to deal with the price of gasoline. We are not sure exactly what is going to happen. There is some indication there will be an increase of production by the OPEC countries. It is not clear exactly how much that will be or what impact it will have. If prices stay high or go higher, I think the American people are going to expect us to look at some alternatives, some short-term relief, and then also have a full debate about what we can do for the future, in terms of more production, alternative fuels, conservation—a whole package of things that are long overdue.

I think we are being given a second warning. We were given a warning in the late 1970s and 1980s when we had high gasoline prices, a shortage of supply, and gasoline lines. We knew there was a problem and that we should do something about it. We made some efforts, but it has not produced the results that we need. We are now dependent on foreign oil for 55 percent of our

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

oil needs. I think that is totally unacceptable and a threat to our national security. During the week, I hope we can engage in some discussion and thought about this. We should be prepared to have some votes in this area next week, after the budget resolution is completed.

THE MARRIAGE PENALTY TAX

Mr. President, the week of April 10, voting not later than April 14, the Senate will have a chance to indicate whether or not it believes we should eliminate the marriage penalty tax. The House has voted overwhelmingly to eliminate that tax. The President has indicated he thinks we should phase it out. Now the Senate Finance Committee has acted on a package that will be available and will be acted on in the Senate that week of April 10. Like the Social Security earnings test, are we finally going to do what we have been talking about for years? The Social Security earnings penalty was in place for 30 years but finally, last week, the Congress did something about it.

We have been talking about how we were going to eliminate the marriage penalty tax for 10 years. Are we going to do it? Are we finally going to do something about it? Also, this one takes on particular significance to me because our daughter was married last May. She and her husband both work. She is a young professional woman. She has discovered this applies to her and that they are going to pay more taxes this year than they did last year, even though they make about the same amount of money. She says: Dad, you must do something. So we did something in the Finance Committee. Will we do it in the Senate? Will we rise to this challenge?

Would anybody like to try to explain this tax to the married couples in America, particularly newly married couples who are first confronted with this marriage penalty tax? Would anybody like to defend it? Would anybody like to explain that it is fair and should be in place? No.

I have asked that question in all kinds of groups with all kinds of backgrounds and philosophies, and not a single hand goes up to defend it. So the Senate has a chance to act affirmatively in this area the week of April 10. I look forward to that.

THE GONZALEZ MATTER

Mr. President, finally, and not least, obviously there is a lot in the news media about the Gonzalez matter. I am not sure this is something that Congress should step into. I would like it to be handled in an appropriate forum, such as a family court, but the Government seems to be involved. The Government seems to be determined to send this young boy back to Cuba. I think that is a mistake, without full opportunity for appeals and an appropriate court consideration of what is best for the young boy.

We may have some opportunity to consider this issue in the Senate. We will be careful about how we proceed. But I do not think we can stand by as if we did not know what was going on. So I hope my colleagues will join me in giving thought to an appropriate way to proceed on this matter.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. If no Senator is seeking recognition at this point, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Nevada.

BUDGET

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the leader is right, this is a historic time. It is historic because this is the week we are going to begin deliberations on the budget that will guide all of our spending for this year. We have 13 appropriations bills and as soon as the budget is adopted, we can start appropriating.

I hope my friends on the majority side of the Senate will understand that we really are doing quite well as a country. This all began in 1993 when we voted on the deficit reduction plan. I am sorry to report it was not done in a bipartisan fashion. Every vote for that deficit reduction plan was cast by a Democrat. It passed the House of Representatives by one vote. In the Senate, it resulted in a tie that was broken by the Vice President of the United States, AL GORE. As a result of that action, the United States has seen on an unprecedented amount of economic expansion.

In April, we reached 107 months of consecutive economic growth, the longest period of economic growth in the history of this country. We are now 2 months beyond that and still growing. We have created about 21 million new jobs. The majority of these jobs are high-wage jobs, high-paying jobs. We have had the lowest unemployment and the lowest inflation in 30 years.

We talk about the size of Government. Well, we have actually done something about the size of Government as a result of the program President Clinton initiated and which was supported in the Senate in 1993 by a tie-breaking vote of Vice President GORE and in the House by one vote. We have cut the size of Government. We have talked about the Government continually getting smaller. Now it is about the same size as when President Eisenhower was President. We talked for a year or two about it being the size when President Kennedy was President. We have gone even beyond that.

Home ownership is the highest in the history of this country. The country is doing very well. I hope we continue the record economic expansion because it does give us a historic opportunity.

We need to save Social Security. We need to make sure it is strengthened. Now that it is going to be OK until about the year 2035, the President wants to move forward and make sure it is OK for another 20 to 30 years. We should do that as soon as we can.

We should do something to expand Medicare so that prescription drugs are part of the program. It is no longer adequate that we have hospitalization and some doctor care for senior citizens. It is important we realize they also need help with prescription drugs.

People over the age of 65 get an average of 18 prescriptions filled every year. We need to do something about that. Sixty percent of senior citizens have trouble paying for prescription drugs. Some do not get the prescription drugs they need. Some, because they do not have enough money, take half a pill a day when they should take one pill a day. They split the pills. People are actually going without food for medicine. We need to make sure that we, in this richest country in the history of the world, the only superpower in the world, have some program for prescription drugs. I hope we do not squander this opportunity.

This already is a Presidential campaign issue. I think we should take a look at what the Republicans are saying about Governor George W. Bush's budget which there is going to be a tremendous tendency to adopt on behalf of the majority.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN says:

> But, more importantly, there is a fundamental difference here. I believe we must save Social Security. We must pay down the debt. We have to make an investment in Medicare. For us to put all the tax cuts—all of the surplus into tax cuts I think is not a conservative effort—I think it's a mistake.

Senator MCCAIN is right. This country has a debt of over $5 trillion. We should address that in this budget. We should not be going on speculative tax cuts. It seems the only thing the Governor of Texas understands as a solution to a problem is a tax cut. We have an energy crisis. What does he recommend? A tax cut, about which I am sure the oil barons, the oil moguls in the Middle East, are jumping for joy. I guess George W. Bush thinks anytime the price of gas goes up, all the Government has to do is lower the tax and continue producing as much oil as before, and it makes the Middle Eastern oil producers very happy.

He also suggested an income tax cut, even though a week ago it was reported in the press all over the country that income tax rates are at their lowest in the majority of categories. Our taxes are lower than they have been for 40 to 50 years, depending on which category one is in. Yet George W. Bush wants an income tax cut. Again, what Senator MCCAIN says about that is:

Thirty-eight percent of Governor Bush's tax cut goes to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

We have Members in the House who disagree with the budget of George W. Bush. LINDSEY GRAHAM says:

It is a large tax cut that's going to eat up all the surpluses if they come about. It does nothing, in my opinion, fiscally responsible to reduce the national debt. It doesn't address the Social Security issue. Here's what Governor Bush said: ''There's plenty of money to take care of the debt, take care of Social Security and give you a big tax cut. The truth is this money is a projection 10 years in the future and Congress' spending plan is going to destroy the projection. If the economy goes south, he—

Meaning George W. Bush—

has dedicated all the surpluses to a tax cut. The $5.8 trillion debt needs to be addressed quickly.

I could not agree more with Representative LINDSEY GRAHAM. We have to address the debt. If we address the debt, we reduce the debt and it is a tax cut for everybody. We pay hundreds of billions of dollars on interest on the debt. If we did not do that, it would be money in everyone's pocket, not just the 38 percent that goes to the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country.

We are going to debate the budget this week to find out if we are going to adequately take care of the needs of this country. Can we meet the demands we have? What demands do we have? One can look at all the appropriations bills and, at random pick, for example, the Interior appropriations bill. Our national parks are the envy of the world, but our national parks have a backlog of renovations and repairs of almost $10 billion. We are closing national parks. The national parks deserve some attention. In the State of Nevada, we only have one national park and it too has a backlog of needed repairs. The people who work for the National Park System live in quarters that are unbelievable. They are bad.

In Grand Canyon National Park, in the sister State of Arizona, they live in facilities that are difficult to describe. They look like big tin cans. People who work to preserve or national parks should not have to live in facilities such as that.

We need to help our National Park System, not only with the living quarters of the people who work in the parks, but also simply to make it so that when tourists visit them, they can visit all the parks, and that the roads are OK, the trails are OK, and, in fact, that we do a better job of preserving our parks.

We can look at every appropriations bill we have to consider this year and there are things that need to be dealt with.

The point I am trying to make is, the American people recognize that there are things we need to do other than cutting taxes. We need to make sure we take care of Social Security, we address education, and, as I have already talked about, we need to do something about Medicare. There are priorities the American people have that are more important than reducing Federal income taxes, which are the lowest they have been in 40 to 50 years.

I hope, as this debate unfolds this week, we will be able to seize upon this opportunity to continue the record economic expansion that was started in the 1993 Budget Deficit Reduction Act. I hope we can meet this historic opportunity, on a bipartisan basis, and vote on amendments that come before us on this budget bill not on strictly a partisan basis but on what is best for this country.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

THE BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is my understanding our focus this week will be on the budget, as it should be. One of the things, of course, that is very necessary is to address the budget each year, and one of the things we haven't done that we should do, and are doing this year, is to address the budget early so we don't find ourselves at the end of the session being sort of at the mercy of the President, who can kind of put the leverage on us to do what he wants us to do or else suspend Government operations and, of course, blame the Congress, which has happened before.

In any event, when we are talking about budgets, it is easy to get off into the detail. That is what we will have to do. My friend from Nevada talked about the plans for spending, and that we will have the budget come up, and that we have fortunately, for the third time in 40 years, some extra money—a surplus—in the operating budget. So many, particularly on the other side of the aisle, are searching for ways to spend the money, which is fine. But it seems to me that the responsible approach we ought to take and the approach I believe most Americans want us to take is to evaluate where we are with respect to Government, what the role of the Federal Government is in these various policies, and to make a determination as to what expenditures ought to be made that are consistent with what we believe to be the legitimate role of the Federal Government.

We need to talk about an analysis of that because what happens for the rest of the year is pretty much guided by what you do in terms of the budget—unless, of course, you simply ignore the budget later on. I hope that is not the case. So we ought to be talking in the areas that will be under consideration. What is the role of the Federal Government with respect to the private sector? What is the role of the Federal Government with respect to local and State government? What role should be played there? It seems to me that that is basically where we ought to begin having made that decision, of course, which won't be unanimous because there is a good deal of philosophical difference as to where we ought to go.

There are those who believe the more money you can spend on behalf of the people by the Federal Government, the better off you are. There are those of us who don't agree with that. Some believe the role of the Federal Government should be limited, that we ought to do the things that encourage people to do things, give them the ability to do things for themselves, and leave many decisions with the people in local and State governments. I agree with that.

We ought to be doing something specifically for Social Security. The President has been talking for several years about ''let's save Social Security.'' But he doesn't have a program at all to do that. Just to say ''let's save Social Security'' isn't the proper approach. Indeed, we have ideas on this side of the aisle as to what we ought to do. Clearly, there are three options as to what you do to make sure the young people now paying in from their first paycheck 12.5 percent will be able to have benefits when the time comes to do that. One is to raise taxes. Very few people are for that. Another, of course, is to reduce benefits. Very few are for that. The third option is to take that account and make it a personal account for the person who has paid in the money, and allow, on their behalf, for this money to be invested in the private sector in equities or bonds or stocks so that the return on that trust fund will be much higher than it is now and the benefits will be there.

We talk about paying down the debt. It is a great idea. We have done very little of that over time. We have a $5 trillion debt. This generation and preceding generations have spent it, and we are going to leave it up to others to pay for it. We have paid down the debt some with respect to taking Social Security money and putting it over there in place of publicly held debt, which is a positive thing to do; the costs are less. Really, to pay it down, we ought to be taking some of the surplus out of the general fund and putting it over there. Frankly, we don't do that unless we have a plan to do it—something like a mortgage in which we say over 15 years, or whatever, we are going to pay that off. Then we can take so much every year to do that, and we are dedicated to doing it. That is not the approach taken by the administration.

There is great concern about tax reduction. I certainly believe we ought to take care of adequate spending, protecting Social Security, paying down the debt, but then what is wrong with tax reduction? That is where the money came from. Just because there is more money coming in as a result of a stronger economy doesn't mean we necessarily have an obligation to spend it, which is what the other side often says we ought to do. Much of the tax reduction is just a fairness issue. For instance, the marriage tax. Why is it that two people who are making a certain amount of money as two single persons get married and they have to pay more taxes on the same amount of earnings? That is very unfair. Part of what we talk about in tax reduction is a matter of fairness. Part of it is also incentives to do other things.

So we will be talking about the Republican budget that will be coming before this Congress, in which we safeguard Social Security, shield Medicare, pay down the national debt, and at the same time work on the fairness issue. We will be protecting that surplus by not spending it, which is unique, only happening in the last several years. It strengthens Medicare by increasing—as we did last year and again this year—some of the reductions that were made in the balanced budget amendment. We will reduce the national debt, hopefully, by using operational funds to do that, as well as Social Security dollars. We will provide tax fairness for families. We need to do that. We need to balance the budget again, as we have for about the third time in 40 years. So that is a very good thing.

This budget, over time, reduces the debt by $177 billion, wipes it out over 13 years—if we stay with this budget. That is the kind of commitment we ought to make. We talked about tax reduction. Think about what it is. This budget would provide about $150 billion in 5 years in tax relief to American families—over $13 billion next year alone in the form of marriage penalty relief which, again, is a fairness tax. In the form of educational assistance now, is reducing taxes a bad thing if we are going to—increase the health care deductibility? I don't believe so. We are seeking to provide more coverage for people—without making a total government program out of it—by giving some kind of tax relief to do that.

I think this is going to be a very important debate and an important discussion. I understand there will be differences of view. That is what this body is all about, talking about different philosophies. There will be different philosophies, such as saying the more spending we have, the better government is and the better off everyone is. That is a point of view. I don't happen to share it. I think there ought to be limitations on the size and role of government. We ought to be building opportunity instead of doing those sorts of things.

I think we have a great opportunity to do some of the things we have talked about for years; that is, to reduce the debt, to secure Social Security, and to provide some incentives for people to do things for themselves.

We have the opportunity, and we will be doing it this week. I think we ought to take into account not only the dollars that are there, and not only the specific expenditures, but how we envision the role of government over time. How does that fit into the idea of freedom and opportunity for all? What is the role of a government in that?

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG AFFORDABILITY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about a very encouraging development and solution with respect to prescription drugs.

I have come to the floor on more than 20 separate occasions over the last several months to talk particularly about how America can no longer afford to deny this critical coverage. Again and again, I cited examples on the floor of this Senate about how our country cannot afford to deny seniors the opportunity to get prescription drug coverage. I have talked, for example, about the exciting anticoagulant drugs. These drugs allow a senior citizen, for example, for perhaps $1,000 or $1,500, to prevent a stroke which might end up costing more than $100,000.

What is so exciting about these prescription medicines is that they don't just help older people when they are very ill, but they are absolutely key to keeping older people healthy by lowering blood pressure and cholesterol. They will help senior citizens stay in the community and will keep them from racking up those much larger health care expenses under what is known as Part A of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

Again and again, we have seen examples of how cholesterol-lowering drugs can reduce death and expenses for senior citizens.

For example, heart disease is the leading cause of death for persons 65 and older. Beta blockers can reduce long-term mortality by 25 percent, and they cost about $360 a year, or $30 a month.

One in five older women has osteoporosis. About 15 percent have suffered fractures as a result this disease. This disease is the leading risk factor for hip fractures. Estrogen replacement can reduce the risk of osteoporosis as well as cardiovascular disease. One commonly used drug costs $20 a month. This is an investment that can help avoid those hip fractures and help avoid the extraordinary medical expenses.

I must say that my own mother, who will be 80 years of age very shortly, had a hip fracture recently, and this drove home to me how these prescription medicines can help avoid the kinds of health problems that my mother and scores of others seniors have seen, and how providing coverage now is an investment this Senate cannot afford to pass up.

What was exciting about the developments in the budget resolution was, first, that the Budget Committee committed $40 billion would be committed for this important program. For example, on the other side of the Capitol, the House of Representatives talked about $40 billion, but they could spend it on just about anything in the health care arena. The Senate Budget Committee said we are going to make $40 billion available for prescription drugs because it is high time we set in place this important coverage.

Second, we provided a date certain to get this job done. Our colleague from Louisiana, Senator BREAUX, has been correct to say repeatedly that the Senate Finance Committee has now held 14 hearings on this issue. Clearly there is great interest in that committee in moving forward.

The budget resolution says on this point that if the Senate Finance Committee does not come forward with a prescription drug benefit on or before September 1st of this year, any Member of the Senate can come to the floor of this body and bring this issue before the Senate.

The Presiding Officer of the Senate, who serves with me on the Senate Committee on Aging, could come to the floor if he had a plan to deal with prescription drugs. Senator SNOWE and I have teamed up on a bipartisan basis. We are particularly grateful for the help of Senator GORDON SMITH last week in the Budget Committee. The resolution allows any group of Senators to come forward with legislation if the Senate Finance Committee does not report a prescription drug measure on or before September 1st of this year.

I think it is critical to note that many Senators in the leadership of both political parties were involved in this effort.

Senator DASCHLE has talked to me almost daily about the importance of the Senate dealing with this issue, and dealing with it this year. He has worked very hard to try to reconcile the various approaches Senators have on this issue. He also has been steadfast in saying how important it is that the Senate not put this off until after another election.

There may be some colleagues on the Republican side and some on the Democratic side who will say: Let's just talk about this in the political campaign.

I believe we can't afford to deny this coverage to the Nation's senior citizens.

Senator DASCHLE has been resolute in saying we ought to go forward and deal with this issue, and deal with it in this session of Congress.

I also want to commend several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Senator DOMENICI, for example, in the Budget Committee, when this issue got to a flash point; it would have been very difficult even to go forward. Senator DOMENICI worked with several of us, particularly Senator SNOWE and Senator SMITH, in order to bring the committee together on this point. We had some bipartisan support last week in the Budget Committee for taking tangible action on this issue.

What is really important is that every Senator understands that I and others are going to stay at this issue again and again and again so the Senate does not miss this historic opportunity.

Too often, whether dating back to catastrophic health care legislation or the failed efforts in 1993 and 1994 to pass comprehensive health care reform, we have muffed. The Congress has muffed the opportunity to put in place a historic breakthrough in terms of health care in our country. I think we have another such opportunity as a result of the work that was done in the Budget Committee last week.

Only about one in four of our senior citizens has prescription drug coverage. Many of them take up to 20 medicines a year. Something like 20 percent of the Nation's senior citizens spend over $1,000 out of pocket now on their prescription medicines. As a result of these and other factors, there is not a single specialist in the health care field and not a Democrat or a Republican who would create a Medicare program today without including prescription drug coverage.

That is why the breakthrough we saw in the Budget Committee last week is so important. I think it is absolutely critical that we keep what was done in the Budget Committee throughout this process. It may be challenged on the floor of the Senate this week. My understanding is that there will be Senators opposed to it, but I think we can build on the work that was done last week in the Budget Committee. Again, I commend Chairman DOMENICI, Senator SNOWE, and Senator GORDON SMITH, my colleague from Oregon, for working with us on it—we can get this done; we can ensure that action on prescription drugs is tied to reform of the Medicare program.

Many of my colleagues have stressed this. I think they are right. I, too, happen to believe it would be better to have comprehensive Medicare reform that includes prescription drug coverage.

I think it is also clear—and I stress this because it is so important to this Senator and many on this side of the aisle—that we cannot afford to wait. We want to use competitive purchasing principles for prescription drug benefit. We will use the kind of principles that make sense in private sector health care. We will ensure the benefit is voluntary. No senior would have to choose this particular benefit if they preferred their existing coverage. However, we do want to put in place a universal coverage program. We want to get it done before this Congress adjourns.

We are going to fight with all our strength to protect what was done in the Budget Committee last week on the floor of the Senate this week and when it goes to conference and throughout the process so that if the Senate Finance Committee does not act to provide this benefit on or before September 1 of this year, that any Member of this body will be able, without facing points of order, come to the floor of the Senate and force the Senate to deal with this critical issue.

I am sure when my colleagues go home and talk to constituents they will find what I have found; that is, the question of prescription drug coverage is one of the two or three most pressing issues our constituents care about.

We have families and older people all across this country who are walking on an economic tightrope balancing their food bills against their fuel bills and their fuel bills against their medical costs.

I have been bringing to the floor of the Senate cases of older people who are supposed to take three pills and they take only two. They are breaking their lipid-lowering capsules in half—the drugs that help to deal with cholesterol and heart problems—because they cannot afford to take the full pill.

I spoke recently about a case from Hillsboro, OR, my home State. A physician actually put an elder person in a hospital for 6 weeks because that elderly man could not afford the medicine on an outpatient basis. Allowing outpatient coverage of medicine is what we are trying to accomplish in the Senate. Seniors could get their medicine without going into the hospital. That older gentleman in Hillsboro, OR, had to be hospitalized for 6 weeks so he could get his medicine paid for under what is known as Part A of the Medicare program. That is a classic example of how, under today's health care system, dollars are wasted by having a person hospitalized rather than getting help in the community and, at the same time, facing the predicament of taking longer to get healthy than if these benefits have been available more promptly on an outpatient basis for the elderly.

Last week's developments in the Budget Committee were encouraging. Many predicted the Budget Committee would not adopt binding language with respect to prescription drugs that would allow the Senate to get this program enacted, and get it enacted this year. However, the Budget Committee came together. I commend my colleagues, Senator SNOWE and Senator GORDON SMITH. They have worked with me for 15 months. We now have funding available in the budget resolution. We have a date certain when it can actually come before the Senate. If the Finance Committee doesn't act on or before September 1, any Senator could bring this issue to the floor of the Senate and it would be tied to the question of Medicare reform.

There is a long way to go. We have to get through the discussion this week. Then we will have a conference committee. Then many Members will work closely with the Finance Committee where there are many interested Senators who have devoted time to this prescription drug issue.

What was done in the Budget Committee last week was something of a breakthrough. It was a very encouraging development for the millions of seniors and families who are watching how Congress deals with this issue, watching to make sure we do it this year, do it on a bipartisan basis, and not just send it out to be another topic and cannon fodder for the political campaign this fall.

As I have made clear, I intend to keep coming back to the floor again and again raising examples of why this Nation cannot afford to deny prescription drug coverage for the elderly. More than 4,000 seniors from Oregon have written me since I have begun this effort. The cases illustrate in a dramatic way how important it is that Congress deal with this issue now.

I intend, with my colleagues, to come back again and again and again until we get this coverage for the Nation's older people. This country can no longer afford to have the Congress deny this coverage. With the work done in the Budget Committee, we have an opportunity now to deal with this issue promptly. The seniors who come to our town hall meetings with their prescription drug bills tell how their private insurance doesn't cover their prescriptions. Because they cannot afford prescription medicine, very often they get sicker. They are the ones who have a right to expect this Congress to act.

The developments last week for the first time give me a tangible sense that we are going to be able to get this done. It was concrete evidence that the Congress understands how important this issue is. Many of my colleagues have said this is one of their top two priorities for this session of Congress. Certainly it is for this Senator. We are going to keep coming back to this floor, stressing the need for action on their prescriptions until the Senate moves to do what should have been done years ago.

When Medicare was enacted in 1965, it did not cover prescription drugs. Now the big buyers, the health maintenance organizations and the health plans, are able to negotiate discounts. That means senior citizens in Alabama, Oregon, and across the country pay more for their medicine because they are not able to get the benefits of the big buyers. Seniors are going to have the power of the big buyers if we can act this session. A number of the key bills before the Senate give older people bargaining power in the marketplace in order to be able to afford their medicine. That is key—affordability—the ability of senior citizens to afford their prescription medicine so they don't have to give up food, rent, and heat.

Making drugs affordable for seniors has been important to all Members who have focused on this issue. Yet there are many seniors who struggle to make ends meet because they cannot get medicine in an affordable way. The budget resolution provides the opportunity now for those seniors to get relief. I will do everything in my power, and there are many of my colleagues who will, as well, to defend what was done in the Budget Committee last week on prescription drugs throughout this process. If we have a floor fight on this measure, those who try to knock out what the Budget Committee did ought to understand how strong Members feel who worked to get that prescription drug coverage in the budget resolution. I hope we will not see that kind of fight.

I hope the work done by Senator SNOWE and Senator SMITH, along with Senator DASCHLE, Senator CONRAD, and myself, the group of Members who worked with the Budget Committee, can be preserved.

It ought to be preserved for the Nation's senior citizens. Those are the people who are counting on us to deliver on this critical issue. I intend to keep coming back to this floor again and again and again until we have achieved this major health care reform that the older people of this country richly deserve.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. I inquire of the Chair, what is the business on the floor at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will then proceed for the next few moments in morning business.

I believe that when I am done, I will also conclude the Senate for the day and take us out, as others who had been planning morning business comments for the day are not going to be with us.

ENERGY PRICES AND GAS TAXES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thought I would come to the floor today to speak again about energy and the current energy cost crisis in which this Nation finds itself.

Many of us have been to the floor numerous times over the last several weeks comparing our current situation and the tremendous runup in gas prices with this administration's lack of an energy policy and how they correlate—or if they relate.

I have said, most critically, over the last several weeks, the only policy in town is the ''tin cup'' policy: Give our Secretary of Energy a tin cup, and send him to foreign oil-producing nations to beg for a little crude.

He has been begging. He wanted a lot more. He begged for 2 million barrels a day in additional production. He got considerably less than that. I think it is now a wait-and-see: How does this level out? What do the markets say? What is the consumer going to pay at the gas pump in July? My guess is, the consumer is going to be paying near $2 a gallon for regular gasoline, depending on where they are in the country.

The reason for this situation is what I would like to talk about this afternoon. Congress can respond in some ways. But we cannot increase oil production in the short term because, largely, we have had a policy of reducing oil production in this country for the last two decades, and it takes time to bring that production back on line. A great many people out there are opposed to increasing domestic production—all in the name of the environment or all in opposition to using hydrocarbons or some other issue that has helped shape the Clinton/Gore energy policy over the last 8 years.

When the Clinton-Gore administration came to town in 1993, its announced intention was to drastically alter the way the Nation used energy, especially fossil fuels. The President and the Vice President determined that a broad-based Btu tax would force us away from coal and oil and natural gas to renewable energies, such as solar and wind and biomass. That objective has remained the hallmark of this administration's energy policy—until now; that is, until the day before yesterday, when the President was blaming the Congress, saying we had failed to reauthorize the Strategic Petroleum Reserve—the salt domes in the Gulf of Mexico, where we have stored about 570 million barrels of crude oil.

The President promised his Btu tax would raise nearly $72 billion over 5 years, from 1994 to 1998, and marketed it as fair, helpful to the environment, that it would force down our dependence on foreign oil, and that it would have trivial impacts on consumers.

Congress did not pass the Btu tax because we thought it would be damaging to the consumer. And over the years we have become increasingly more dependent upon foreign oil. I doubt the President can declare a victory because he was unable to suck $72 billion out of the back pockets of Americans while at the same time he advanced policies that slowed down crude oil production in our country.

In fact, the Btu tax would have unfairly punished energy-intensive States and industries. Estimates by the American Petroleum Institute and the National Association of Manufacturers predicted the tax would hurt exports, reduce GDP by $38 billion, and destroy 700,000 American jobs.

That is why the Congress finally refused to pass the tax, over the President's and the Vice President's objection. Vice President GORE and President Clinton claimed the tax was needed to balance the budget and fund large new spending programs to offset the negative impact of the tax. They also claimed that use of crude oil imports would be reduced by 400,000 barrels a day.

At that time, DOE's own projections predicted—this is the President's own Department of Energy—that the tax would shave oil import growth by less than one-tenth in 10 years. DOE also predicted that by the year 2000, Americans would depend on foreign oil for three-fifths of their total crude oil requirements.

So quite the opposite was going on inside the administration. The President was talking politics, and his own Department of Energy was analyzing the matter and coming up with some very interesting facts.

The American Petroleum Institute, in testimony, said:

> . . . even if imports were to fall by the full 400,000 barrels a day claimed by the Administration, the cost of $34 billion in lost GDP is excessive relative to other alternatives for improving energy security. Using the Administration's optimistic predictions, the cost of the Btu tax works out to about $230 per barrel.

Of course, that would have been devastating to an economy that is highly dependent upon fossil fuels that not only make our cars and trucks go, but feed the whole petrochemical industry which manufactures carpeting, herbicides, pesticides, insecticides, and plastics, all of those things that make up our very large, integrated economy—therefore, the 700,000 estimated jobs lost if we were to raise the price of crude oil to $230 a barrel.

In the end, Congress did the right thing; we refused the President's and the Vice President's policy and said it would simply create havoc in our economy. Congress did agree to raise taxes on transportation fuels by 4.3 cents—the first time the Congress has actually put a tax on fuel—and then put it into the general fund of the Treasury. Of course, it was argued to be a deficit reduction tax.

A couple of years ago, we finally pulled that tax out of the general fund and put it back in the surface transportation fund, where all highway fuels taxes have gone historically, to fund the construction of roads, highways, and bridges.

The Clinton-Gore administration's obsession with fossil fuel use reduction has actually put us in the position we find ourselves today. The President, on March 7, 2000, at the White House said:

Americans should not want them [oil prices] to drop to $12 or $10 a barrel again because that. . .takes our mind off our business, which should be alternative fuels, energy conservation, reducing the impact of all this on global warming.

He is referring again to the cost of fuel. He simply said it would move us away from a desire for alternative fuels if we were to see low gasoline and fuel prices. Isn't that terrible? The alternative fuels were synthetics, highly subsidized by as much as $25 to $30 a barrel by tax money and, of course, alternative energy and electricity by solar voltaic cells and by wind machines.

The only problem is, I have not yet seen a car, or a truck for that matter, going down the road with a solar cell on the top of it. I don't think they run very well that way. Somehow the President and the Vice President, in their hatred of fossil fuels, have forgotten that point.

That is kind of an overview of 1993 to the present. What has happened during this administration? Domestic oil production is down 17 percent, and our crude oil consumption is up 14 percent. Dependence on foreign sources of crude oil has risen to 56 percent of our total crude requirements. In 1973, during the Arab oil embargo, our dependency was only 36 percent. I can remember that time.

I am sure some listening this afternoon will remember the gas lines, the frustration and even the violence that occurred when Americans found out for the first time there wasn't an abundance of energy. There was a shortage. They couldn't get what they needed for their commuting or the running of their businesses.

Since that time, while this country has struggled to put a policy together, other policies of our Government, largely environmental policies—some for the right reason—have progressively reduced our overall ability to produce and use domestic energy sources. That, coupled with the fixation of this administration on eliminating fossil fuels, now brings us to that point where we are now over 56-percent dependent.

We all remember in the early 1990s we were fighting a war in the Middle East. Why? Well, to help some of our allies. Those allies were large producers of crude oil, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. We were fighting Iraq because the Iraqis had crossed the border and started the war. In the end, as they retreated and we were victorious, they set fire to many oil wells in Kuwait. We remember that phenomenal picture from the Middle East of black clouds of smoke as those oil wells burned. Many of our oil field workers went in and put the fires out for our neighbors.

Now, what is the irony of that? Today, the very enemy we fought is selling over 700,000 barrels of crude oil each day to the United States. Something is wrong about that. Something is wrong about an absence of foreign policy that has allowed that to happen. That is the reality of where we are.

Americans grow angry when they understand this administration only has excuses and solar cells and windmills for an energy policy. They understand that the Clinton/Gore foreign policy, working hand in glove with its non-energy policy, now tolerates that we buy Iraqi oil.

Of course, we are not sure where that money goes and what it is used for. Is Saddam Hussein being allowed to build another war machine with the millions of dollars a day that pour out of the pockets of our consumers into the treasury of Iraq? The Clinton-Gore administration, while making much of increased appliance efficiency, greater use of renewables from biomass and other ideas, ignores a very fundamental fact. A large part of our energy use cannot be addressed by these measures.

I am not suggesting we not pursue new technologies and alternatives. Where a solar cell fits, put one up; where wind farms work, we ought to have them. We ought to be striving to build the efficiencies of the new wind turbines. At the same time, those will not fuel a nation that produces the kind of growth we produce and builds its efficiencies based on flexible transportation and the ability to send our people and our products in an integrated way around the Nation and around the world.

The administration's failure to encourage domestic oil production and production of coal and natural gas has led us to this point of near crisis. This Congress will engage in the very near future in debating the issue to see what we can do in the short term to help solve the pressure being placed on our consumers, but we also will be looking at long-term policy to see if we can't begin to produce more of our own resources again.

For example, if we have the right tax incentives and if we were able and willing to build a floor for the small 15-barrel-or-less producer, we are not talking about the major oil companies. We are talking farmers and ranchers and private property owners spread all across the mid to lower south central part of our country and southwest that are known as stripper well producers. Their break even is about $17 a barrel. When gas oil crude prices went to $10 a barrel last year, many of those wells were shut in. If we would help encourage that production once again, we could produce well over a million barrels of oil back into our economy that is not producing today.

I think that is tremendously good policy, if the tradeoff is putting money in Saddam Hussein's hand to build a new war machine versus helping subsidize or provide incentives for the small producer across this country to bring back on line a million barrels a day of domestic crude oil.

The administration has refused to acknowledge the vast oil reserves and gas reserves we have offshore and in ANWR, the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. We know we can explore and produce in these areas in an environmentally sound way. ANWR is an area about the size of Dulles Airport relative to the whole State of Virginia. Those opposed to exploring ANWR would have you believe that if we drilled inside Dulles Airport that it would pollute the whole State of Virginia.

How foolish can some of these people get who make those kinds of arguments? The President listened. The Vice President listened. They have refused to promote a policy that would allow safe and sound drilling to provide the energy for our country.

The Clinton-Gore administration recently announced a ban on future exploration for most of the Federal Outer Continental Shelf through the year 2012. That is where the real big oil reserves are left in this country, offshore. I know we all remember the oil spills of 20 years ago on the coast of California. What no one is talking about is the tremendous new technology that has been applied to the gulf and other areas where drilling goes on, where wells don't leak today and blowouts don't happen. If they do occur accidentally, they are immediately shut down. All of those technologies are in existence. I think anyone who has looked at the record of drilling in the Gulf of Mexico recognizes that it is clean and it is sound. It is extracting the resource and is having almost a zero impact on the environment of the gulf area and its coast lines.

In 1996, the administration resorted to the little used 1906 Antiquities Act. The President argued it was a major emergency and he had to lock up these millions of acres in Utah. What he was really locking up, for fear that it might be mined, was 23 billion tons of low-sulfur, high-value coal that could have been used to generate electricity in our country today and well into the future.

All of these areas that would have been mined—and they were a very small part of the over 1 million acres that the President locked up in the Grand Starcase/Escalante National Monument—would have been reclaimed in a natural way because that is part of the environmental policy of our country today. If you are going to disturb the land, once you have done so, you must put it back in as near a natural way as is possible.

The Clinton-Gore administration has vetoed legislation that would have opened the Coastal Plain of the remote Alaskan national wildlife reserve. It is estimated that there are 15 billion barrels of domestic crude oil up there.

The administration also has ignored a report prepared by the National Petroleum Council, requested by the Energy Secretary, explaining how the Nation can increase production and use of domestic natural gas resources from about 22 trillion cubic feet per year to more than 30 trillion cubic feet per year over the next 10 to 12 years. In other words, we could add nearly 10 trillion cubic feet of new domestic gas to our energy mix.

That would allow the Northeast, which is tremendously dependent upon oil for space heat, to convert to a much cleaner fuel, a much more efficient fuel, a fuel of natural gas, and bring down their dependency on oil fuel for home heat and space heat.

The Clinton-Gore administration has shown little interest in solving our domestic energy problems until now, as the foreign oil producers have forced crude up to over $30 a barrel last month. Gasoline prices, last week, were $2 a gallon in San Francisco.

Mr. President, I argue that the Clinton-Gore administration has acted in other ways designed to force us away from the use of a reliable, available, relatively inexpensive fossil fuel, and the only argument the President had this weekend during his radio address was: Congress, you are to blame.

Yet I have listed numerous vetoes or efforts to block our administrative and rulemaking processes that have actually blocked production in our country. That is why many of us have suggested to this President that he needs to step back and work with Congress to define a national energy policy that promotes increased domestic crude oil and natural gas production, while looking at all of the other alternatives we have and the new technologies, especially clean coal technology. Nothing should be done in isolation of the other. It ought to well be a total package that we would want to work on.

My distinguished friend from West Virginia, Senator ROBERT BYRD, spoke eloquently last week on the subject. I want to add a few thoughts to his comments. The U.S. has the world's largest demonstrated coal reserve base and more than 90 percent of our total fossil fuel energy reserves are in coal. Yet this administration has downplayed new coal-burning and clean coal technologies—the very kind of thing we ought to want to bring online as much of our electricity is generated by coal, and as we define and refine the science of global warming and attempt to understand the cause or causes and how to respond. At present rates of consumption our coal will last for up to 270 years. In other words, we blessed with huge coal reserves. Yet this administration's lack of policy has forced us into near crisis. Coal is used to generate 56 percent of our electrical supply and about 88 percent of the Midwest's electrical needs. Coal use for electrical power has risen more than 250 percent since 1970, while sulfur dioxide emissions has decreased by 21 percent due to technology and, in part, due to some of the money we put into research sponsored here that has moved that kind of technology.

Now, as my colleagues think about all of this, here is a quote I found by the President over the weekend. Remember, I was talking about coal. I was talking about our tremendous need for production of electricity. Here is what the President was saying over the weekend:

> I think to a much greater degree, then, we have a commitment to the notion that we can improve the environment while we grow the economy—

None of us disagrees with that. But he goes on,

> . . . that is what the whole global warming issue is about. All over the world, there are people who just don't believe that you can get rich unless you put more stuff in the air that heats up the earth. They think you have got to burn more coal and oil in the digital economy. That is not true.

Mr. President, what you have said isn't true. What runs the digital economy of our country? What turns on the computer? What fires up the Internet? A solar cell? A wind mill? I don't think so, Mr. President. It is the abundance of electrical power.

Let me repeat: Coal use for electrical power has risen more than 250 percent since 1970, and the sulfur dioxide emissions during that time have actually decreased by 21 percent. Furthermore, the gas the Clinton/Gore administration blames for global warming, carbon dioxide, isn't a poisonous gas and isn't regulated under the Clean Air Act.

The point I am making is simply this: An abundant economy—the kind we are experiencing today that has us at or near full employment—is a direct result of an abundance of relatively inexpensive energy. The history of our country has been based on the availability of energy. That is why we are the wealthy Nation we are today. Look at the rest of the countries of the world; as they strive to grow and provide an economy for their people, they develop their energy base.

My wife and I and a group of business people from Idaho were in China in December. The skies were so dark there in Beijing that you could hardly see because they don't have the clean coal technology we have. Yet they are growing very rapidly and they need an abundant source of energy. They are building dams and nuclear reactors, and they are searching for a cleaner way to burn their coal because they know if they are to grow and provide their country and their citizens with opportunity, they are going to have to use coal to generate electric energy. President Clinton, I don't think you really get it. Do you think this new hitech, digital economy happens out there on its own? It is, in fact, a product of a nation who has an abundant energy base. In November of 1999, the EPA sued several coal-burning utilities, claiming they had made major modifications in their facilities without applying for new resource review permits. Utilities maintained that these were modifications made during routine maintenance. They were still providing high-quality energy with less emissions. Why is EPA out there suing at this moment, at a time when there is a deficiency of energy in this country and we ought to be promoting more? Certainly, we ought to be promoting it with all of the newest technology. But you don't do that by suing; you do that with policies that encourage people to do the right thing.

Lastly—and this is the irony of this administration which likes to think it has an energy policy—this morning, Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt is out looking for a dam to tear down. Eight years ago, he said he would like to knock down a really big dam while he is Secretary of Interior. Really big dams produce a lot of big power, Mr. Secretary, or haven't you figured that out? Big renewable power, hydropower. It doesn't have emissions; it is very clean. Yes, our fathers and forefathers chose to dam some rivers to generate electricity. Those were efficient ways to do it then, and they are finding out they are environmentally sound ways to do it now. Yet Mr. Babbitt wants to tear down one, two, or three dams, or I guess as many as he can get his hands on, or find a policies that make it difficult to keep these dams running.

Why don't we simply work to improve those dams? Why don't we make them more efficient by adding new technology to the dams, putting new turbines in them that are friendly and more efficient. It is beginning to happen nationwide. Why should we deny our country 20 percent of its energy base, or bad mouth that energy source, or attempt to tear it down? No, what I am trying to say this afternoon in this collection of thoughts is, Mr. President, I don't think you get away by just pointing a finger at a single action of the Congress and saying you didn't give me emergency authority over the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, so therefore our energy crisis is your fault, Congress.

I think I have named 15 or 20 issues on which this administration has taken a strong anti-energy, anti-production approach toward dealing with energy policy in this country. Mr. President, we can solve our energy problems. We are a marvelously creative Nation. But we don't do it by simply saying no. We do it by producing where we can produce, by creating less dependency on foreign sources, while at the same time building the kind of science and technology that allows us ever increasing energy efficiency and environmental improvement. I think in the coming years we are going to debate the global climate change issue. Getting rid of hydrocarbons isn't the answer. Getting rid of fossil fuels isn't the answer. It is finding better and more efficient ways to use them, and then allowing our technology to be sold and transferred to the world at large. If our clean coal technology were at use in China today, China would be a healthier, more environmentally clean place to live.

Someday they will be able to afford that technology, and they will want it. It is our businesses and our companies that develop it that ought to be encouraged to sell it to them. That is called leadership. It simply isn't crawling into a cave and getting a candle to light your way and heat your space. It is building an efficient system recognizing that all sources of energy ought to be at play at this moment so that we can truly develop an abundant energy package for ourselves and our Nation's future. Thank you Mr. President.

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL WEBSTER, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to recognize and say farewell to an outstanding Air Force officer and former Marine, Brigadier General Ernest R. Webster, upon his retirement from the Air Force after more than thirty-two years of commissioned service. Throughout his career, Brigadier General Webster has served with distinction, and it is my privilege to recognize his many accomplishments and to commend him for the superb service he has provided the Air Force and our Nation.

General Webster is a native of my home State, having been born in Anguilla, Mississippi. He entered the United States Marine Corps Officer Candidate School Quantico, Virginia in 1967. After successfully qualifying as a Marine aviator, he served as a pilot and intelligence officer for the Naval Special Landing Forces in the Caribbean region. He served his nation as an aviator in Southeast Asia while stationed with the 1st Marine Air Wing in the Republic of Vietnam. General Webster was an aircraft maintenance officer and test pilot at New River, North Carolina prior to his transfer into the United States Air Force in January 1972. After attending Maintenance Officer School at Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, he was assigned to Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, where he was chief of maintenance, flight examiner, chief of safety, and operations officer for the 301st Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron.

As a major, he was assigned to Sheppard and Little Rock Air Force Bases for flight training where he mastered the C–130 Hercules weapon system. His next assignment was chief of safety for the 920th Weather Reconnaissance Group at Keesler Air Force Base in Biloxi, Mississippi. He then moved to March Air Force Base, California, serving as deputy commander for operations at the 303rd Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron. He was promoted to colonel in 1985.

During that same year, Colonel Webster took command of the 907th Tactical Airlift Group, Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base, in Ohio. He was promoted to deputy chief of staff for operations, Headquarters 14th Air Force, Dobbins Air Force Base, Headquarters Air Force Reserve, to serve as assistant deputy chief of staff for operations where he played a critical role in the call-up of thousands of Air Force reserve members to Southwest Asia during Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm. He then moved to Duke Field, Florida, to assume command of the 919th Special Operations Wing where he directed critical tactical operations. In 1994 he assumed command of the 403rd Wing at Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi. Colonel Webster was promoted to Brigadier General in 1995.

General Webster's accomplishments are many. Units under his command received the Outstanding Unit Award in three of the five years he was in command. His ''Flying Jennies'' of the 815th Airlift Squadron accomplished Denton Amendment humanitarian missions in Honduras, Argentina, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Russia, and many other areas struck by disaster. His ''Hurricane Hunters'' of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron were world-famous for providing critical hurricane information to residents of coastal areas in the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

During his stellar career, General Webster has served the United States Marine Corps, the United States Air Force, and our great Nation with excellence and distinction. He provided exemplary leadership to the best-trained, best-equipped, and best-prepared citizen-airmen force in the history of our Nation. General Webster is a model of leadership and is a living example of our military's dedication to the core values of service before self, integrity first, and excellence in all endeavors.

General Webster will retire from the United States Air Force on April 3, 2000 after thirty-two years and six months of dedicated commissioned service. On behalf of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I wish General Webster blue skies and safe landings. Congratulations on completion of an outstanding and successful career.

ESTUARY PARTNERSHIP RESTORATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I would like to say just a few words about the Estuary Partnership Restoration Act of 1999, which was passed by unanimous consent on Thursday March 30th. This bill contains language that reauthorizes the Chesapeake Bay Program. The success of the Bay program, and the partnerships that have been established as a result of that program, have led to improved water quality in the Bay, enhanced the lives of those of us lucky enough to live in the Chesapeake watershed, and added to the body of scientific knowledge that we have about estuaries, fisheries, and watersheds in general.

As Governor of Virginia I negotiated the original Chesapeake Bay Agreement. Last week, I had the opportunity to see that the Senate recognizes all the successes that have come from that program. The fact that the Chesapeake Bay program has enough support to be passed by unanimous consent is gratifying indeed. I am also excited at the prospect of expanding the oyster restoration program, which will enhance Bay water quality in a number of ways, and will continue to work for that expansion.

My only regret is that John Chafee, the original architect of the Estuary Habitat Restoration Partnership Act, was not here with us. His leadership on these issues was steadfast, his ability to convince us all to take right action remarkable. I was thinking of John Chafee, last week, wishing he could have joined in the happy moment that he helped make possible. I was happy to have the opportunity to contribute to his legacy, and know that his work will be with us for years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE LIEUTENANT COLONEL, UNITED STATES ARMY RETIRED MARGARET L. ELLERMAN

• Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and honor the late Lieutenant Colonel Margaret L. Ellerman, United States Army Retired.

A native of Michigan, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman entered the Army as a private in 1964, after seven years of teaching in parochial schools. Following attendance at basic training and advanced individual training, she was selected for Officer Candidate School, from which she graduated in 1966.

Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman served as a Finance Officer for most of her career in a variety of command and staff positions. In 1968, she was selected for overseas duty in Germany, in an era when military women were virtually hand-picked for duty outside the United States. Other overseas assignments followed in Thailand and Turkey. Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman received numerous military honors, awards and decorations. Among these were three awards of the Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal and the Good Conduct Medal.

While on active duty, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman, received her Bachelor of Science Degree in 1972 from Eastern Michigan University, and her Masters in Business Administration from Northwest Missouri State University. In addition, she was a graduate of numerous professional military finance and resource management courses. In 1977, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman was a graduate of the United States Army Command and General Staff College.

After retirement from the United States Army in 1986, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman entered civilian employment at the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, from which she retired in 1998. Upon this retirement, she founded her own corporation, Partners In Success, which assisted individuals establish their own businesses.

From 1991 until her death in March 2000, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman continued to serve her country and the women who had, are, and will serve in the military forces of the United

States. She lent her considerable energy and economic knowledge to the Women In Military Service For America Memorial Foundation on the Board of Directors. Joining the cause in 1991, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman worked tirelessly to see that this Memorial, housing and showcasing the achievements of all women who serve our nation in military service, was funded, erected and dedicated in October 1997. Through her ''behind the scenes'' efforts, this Memorial stands as a monument to our countrywomen who freely choose to dedicate their lives in military service to the United States.

Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman never stopped sharing the part of her that made her a dedicated teacher, career Army Officer, and philanthropic entrepreneur. Her charismatic character continues to inspire the men and women who knew and worked with her. The Department of Defense and the American people were well served by this selfless and dedicated Army soldier and civilian citizen.●

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT TAYLOR

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Bob Taylor on his accomplishments at the University of Louisville Business School and in the Louisville business community.

From the moment Bob took over the reigns at UofL's business school in 1984, good things started to happen. Bob is a man of vision and incredible instincts about what works in the business world. He brought those talents to UofL to improve the quality of the program and strengthen the students' capabilities in a real-life business environment. Bob succeeded at both of those goals and brought UofL's rankings among U.S. business schools up to an honorable level and continues to rise in national recognition.

Numerous academic achievements mark Bob's tenure at UofL, including Success magazine's recent naming of UofL as one of the best in the nation for training entrepreneurs. Also, the business school has begun offering master's level programs overseas and now offers varied advanced degrees.

Several personal achievements are evidence of Bob's knowledge of and influence in the business world. He became the president of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business last year, which serves as the accrediting body for business schools nationwide. Bob also serves the community on the board of directors for the Rawlings Company, Logan Aluminum Inc., the Louisville Police Administration Advisory Commission, and the Metro United Way.

Many of Bob's colleagues and members of the Louisville business community have noted his extraordinary leadership skills. Bob took on a huge responsibility when he came to UofL, and he continues to press on to reach higher goals for the school. For this, I commend Bob and thank him for his dedication to UofL. His hard work has paid off and students from across the state and even the nation are reaping the benefits of Bob's success. His experience in business and success at Louisville is a sign of more good things to come for the school and the great State of Kentucky.

Bob, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, thank you for your commitment to the students and faculty at UofL's College of Business and Public Administration. I have every confidence in your ability to lead the school to even greater heights with more accomplishments and successes in the years to come.

Mr. President, I also ask that an article which ran in the Louisville Courier-Journal on Sunday, March 19, 2000, appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Mar. 19, 2000]

U OF L DEAN DOUBLES AS CIVIC LEADER—LOW-KEY LEADER GUIDES A SCHOOL AND A COMMUNITY

(By David McGinty)

When he arrived in Louisville in 1984 to become dean of the University of Louisville's business school, Robert Taylor did not expect to hang around.

''I was going to stay here three years and move on,'' he recalled.

For perhaps one of the few times in his life, Taylor's expectation for the future was faulty. At the time, he thought his job would be fairly simple: To help a small business school win accreditation.

Tayor did not foresee the complications and twists that life would throw in his path, or where they would lead.

The business school now has master's-level programs in three overseas locations, offers several advanced degrees and is becoming known in academic circles.

In a recent U.S. News and World Report survey its undergraduate programs ranked 93rd among more than 327 programs—not in the top ranks, but a big step up from the bottom levels the program once inhabited.

Success magazine has ranked the school's program for training entrepreneurs among the best in the nation. And last year Taylor became president of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, the accrediting body for business schools.

Apart from his academic accomplishments, Taylor may also be one of the most influential civic figures you never hear of.

He serves on a number of boards, charities and advisory bodies, including the boards of directors of the Rawlings Co. and Logan Aluminum Inc. and the Louisville Police Administration Advisory Commission. He is most proud, he said, of his service on the board of Metro United Way—but his greatest influence may be through less visible activities.

Although his style is low-key and his name rarely surfaces publicly, behind-the-scenes business and political leaders have learned he is a prescient adviser, and they seek him out. His contacts are widespread and so, although it is subtle and anonymous, is his contribution to Louisville's economic well-being.

''You've got to put him among the top five'' civic leaders whose contributions are not publicly known, said Bill Samuels, president of Maker's Mark distillery.

Samuels, a longtime friend, said Taylor ''is as bright as anybody I've ever met. . . . I've never had a dull conversation with him, and I've had several thousand. In a sense he's been a mentor to me.''

Former Louisville Mayor Jerry Abramson said that while he was in office he often worked with Taylor, particularly in urban workshops on visits to other cities to observe their accomplishments. After a visit Taylor would lead group discussions on what lessons could be learned, and he proved to be an adroit moderator with a gift for shaping a plan of action.

''Whenever we needed someone who could think outside the box and be a visionary and push the envelope a little bit, we always looked to the dean,'' Abramson said.

''There have been times when we worked on issues that I wasn't ready for a public discussion on, that I would take him into my confidence. He's a tremendous listener, and he can frame a consensus out of disparate views.''

''He's probably one of the biggest assets to the community,'' said David Wilkins, chairman of Doe-Anderson Advertising and Public Relations. ''He moves in and out of virtually every circle and level of the community with ease. He's trusted and respected by everybody.''

Wilkins' relationship with Taylor is a close one, with an unusual twist. In 1994, in what Taylor said was a pivotal moment for him, he took a six-month sabbatical to work at Wilkins' agency and learn firsthand how the business world works.

At the time, Taylor was winding up a decade of busy and often frustrating activity. He took charge of the business school just as it was entering an unforeseen period of problems and change.

At Doe-Anderson, Taylor made an abrupt eye-opening transition from academia to the business world. He quickly learned ''that the environment business people were facing was changing daily.''

''Everything was getting much faster,'' Taylor said. ''The turnaround time on work was faster, the demands were faster. In order to be successful, they had to be completely flexible.''

Taylor's own background is a mix of academic and military, with no private business experience. A native of Pittsburgh, he graduated from Allegheny College in 1961 with a U.S. Air Force commission through the ROTC. Later he received advanced business degrees from Ohio State University and Indiana University.

He had a eight-year stint at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado, rising to head the Department of Economics, Geography and Management. After retiring from the Air Force in 1981 he joined the faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, where he headed the division of business and economics. From that job he came to U of L.

After his stint at Doe-Anderson, Taylor returned to U of L convinced that the business school was not keeping up with the world outside, so he set up teams of faculty to reorganize the school.

''I said, 'Look, gang, we are not adapting quickly enough. We've got to do something different so that we have the same sense of urgency, the same flexibility that our students must have if they're going to be successful in business.' ''

The response, Taylor acknowledged, was not overwhelming. One faculty member said he'd left the business world because ''I didn't want that kind of frenzy.''

And some of the results weren't successful. But such stumbles are part of progress, Taylor believes, and the school has made progress. When he came back from his sabbatical, he set long-range goals for the school.

He wanted it to achieve national recognition for its public administration programs. That recognition is coming, and the school's overseas programs are gaining an international reputation and alumni base.

He wanted the schools entrepreneurial program to start new, student-run businesses. That effort is beginning to get off the ground through a venture-capital fund, a telecommunications research center intended to incubate new businesses and the aid of former business executives on the faculty.

He wanted the school's endowment to top $25 million. It has topped $21 million and is growing.

In Louisville's business community the school's reputation is increasingly solid, in no small part because of Taylor's own credibility. Civic figures who have worked with him say he has been a prescient advocate—sometimes the first—for coming economic trends.

He was one of the first voices in the community to preach the importance of new technology and the Internet.

Doug Cobb, who was until recently president of Greater Louisville Inc., said Taylor ''is the original champion of the idea that Louisville needs to be more entrepreneurial.''

Cobb, himself one of the city's foremost advocates of entrepreneurial activity, said he feels like ''I walk in his steps a little bit.''

To Taylor, this kind of trailblazing is part of the job. ''I feel like my responsibility to this community is that we have to be on the leading edge, and somebody has to be telling people what is happening.''

It has not always been rewarding work, and by his own account Taylor has not always been successful. In the early 1990s, he foresaw a coming shortage of workers in the community and began urging measures to attract immigrants to Louisville.

But when he proposed such steps to a committee planning economic-development strategies for the community, the reception was hostile. ''I'll never forget. A couple of aldermen and other people just berated me, saying we've got unemployed in this community we've got to help first.''

Without rancor, Taylor characterized that period as his ''biggest failure'' to direct the community's attention to an important issue.

Now, of course, employers are straining to find qualified workers. Civic leaders are pondering how to ensure that the community will have enough workers in the future to support economic growth—and one of the strategies is to attract immigrants.

''I think if we had been prepared, we wouldn't have had the pressure on our work force that we have today, and we could be bringing in more people than we bring in now,'' he said.

That's an opportunity missed. Taylor now is pushing the community's business leaders not to miss other opportunities that he sees, particularly in rapidly evolving technologies.

Traditionally, Taylor said, Louisville has been content to follow economic trends. That's got to stop, he said. ''I'm saying the trends are occurring so quickly we can't afford a time lag. We have to go and grab it.''

Taylor is already pushing his faculty to what he sees as emerging possibilities for global education—a degree program that involves courses in two countries, two universities, two languages, two cultures.

''That's my new vision,'' he said, and he admits that when he espouses it ''some people are looking at me like I've gone off the deep end.''

To his friends, that's just vintage Bob Taylor.

''He's such an individualist,'' Samuels said. ''He enjoys ideas that are in the unconventional vein. And I've got so much respect for his judgment. I think he'd make a wonderful CEO.''●

NATIONAL COUNTY GOVERNMENT WEEK

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to salute the work of the 3,072 county governments nationwide, and in particular the work of the 87 counties in my home State of Minnesota. Counties are often an invisible, but extremely important part of our intergovernmental system. As we enter the new millennium, it is important to review our past as we look to the future.

County governments began as a response to the needs of the early settlers of our country, tracing their beginnings to the roots of the Anglo-Saxon local government 1,000 years ago. Counties first appeared in colonial America, making them older than the Republic itself.

Traditionally, counties performed state-mandated duties which included assessment of property, record-keeping, such as property and vital statistics, maintenance of rural roads, and administration of election and judicial functions. Today, counties are moving rapidly into other areas, undertaking programs relating to consumer protection, economic development, employment training, planning and zoning, and water quality, to name just a few.

During the week of April 9–15, counties across the country are celebrating National County Government Week. This celebration is an annual event for counties. First held in 1991, the goal of National County Government Week is to raise public awareness and understanding about the roles and responsibilities of the Nation's counties.

More than 1,000 counties annually participate in National County Government Week by holding a variety of programs and events at the national, State and local levels. These include tours of county facilities, presentations in schools, meetings with business and community leaders, recognition programs for volunteers, briefings on environmental projects, and the adoption of proclamations.

There is a theme each year for National County Government Week. This year, the theme is ''Honoring Volunteers.'' The National Association of Counties will recognize the top county volunteer programs in the country at a ceremony April 13 in Washington, D.C. Counties will receive awards for their ''Acts of Caring'' efforts that they undertook using volunteers to improve their country's quality of life.

I know that NACo has encouraged counties to hold a town meeting this week during National County Government Week or launch a series of community-wide dialogues to solicit citizen participation in identifying the community's most pressing issues and establishing a comprehensive vision for the future. I hope many Minnesota counties will participate in these activities.

NACo has also suggested that, as we enter the new millennium, counties reflect on the past and prepare for the future. As part of that process, counties may want to apply for the designation of Millennium Community. This designation, presented by the White House Millennium Council, is given to counties and cities that have established programs that ''Honor the Past—Imagine the Future.''

One of NACo's priorities for this year is economic development. The organization is encouraging counties to create and expand businesses, noting the fact that businesses not only provide jobs, but also keep taxes in check. Therefore, counties have been encouraged to promote economic development programs.

Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today to support the efforts of our county governments not only in Minnesota, but throughout the country. National County Government Week will again be successful in raising pubic awareness of the good work of our nation's county governments and how they help improve the lives of their residents.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–8297. A communication from the Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration transmitting a report relative to the new Byron G. Rogers Federal Building-Courthouse in Denver, CO; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8298. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, San Diego County, San Joaquin Valley Unified, and Ventura County Air Pollution Control Districts'' (FRL #6569–9), received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8299. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion'' (FRL #6570–2), received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8300. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District'' (FRL #6569–5), received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8301. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision to the Water Quality Planning and Management Regulation Listing Requirements'' (FRL #6569–7), received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8302. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Corrections to: Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Guidelines for Control of Existing Sources: Municipal Solid Waste Landfills'' (FRL #6570–4), received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8303. A communication from the Secretary of Labor and Chairman of the Board, and the Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–8304. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Strategy and Threat Reduction, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the elimination of Russian SS–18 ICBMs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–8305. A communication from the Regulatory Policy Officer, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Increase in Tax on Tobacco Products and Cigarette Papers and Tubes (64 FR 71937)'' (RIN 1512–AB88), received March 28, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–8306. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Blocked Persons, Specially Designated Nationals, Specially Designated Terrorists, Foreign Terrorist Organizations, and Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers: Additional Designations and Removal and Supplementary Information on Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers'' (Appendix A to 31 CFR Chapter V), received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 30, 2000, the following report was submitted on March 31, 2000, during the adjournment of the Senate:

By Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 101: An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and revising the budgetary levels for fiscal year 2000 (Rept. No. 106–251).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 2339. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsements for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel EAGLE; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2340. A bill to direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish a program to support research and training in methods of detecting the use of performance-enhancing substances by athletes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1364

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1364, a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to increase public awareness regarding the benefits of lasting and stable marriages and community involvement in the promotion of marriage and fatherhood issues, to provide greater flexibility in the Welfare-to-Work grant program for long-term welfare recipients and low income custodial and noncustodial parents, and for other purposes.

S. 2060

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2060, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world, and for other purposes.

S. 2235

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2235, a bill to amend the Public Health Act to revise the performance standards and certification process for organ procurement organizations.

S. 2284

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2284, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 2308

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2308, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assure preservation of safety net hospitals through maintenance of the Medicaid disproportionate share hospital program.

S. 2314

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2314, a bill for the relief of Elian Gonzalez and other family members.

S. RES. 279

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 279, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations should hold hearings and the Senate should act on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 101—SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2001 THROUGH 2005 AND REVISING THE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, reported under authority of the order of the Senate of March 30, 2000, the following original concurrent resolution; which was placed on the Calendar on March 31, 2000:

S. CON. RES. 101

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 as authorized by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the revised budgetary levels for fiscal year 2000 as authorized by section 304 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are the revised levels for fiscal year 2000 and the appropriate levels for the fiscal years 2001 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,464,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,501,658,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,546,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,598,771,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,655,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,720,654,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: −$877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$13,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$24,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$30,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$37,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$43,448,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,467,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,471,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,502,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,614,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,670,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,730,514,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution and the revised fiscal year 2000 resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,441,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,447,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,469,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,589,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,644,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,705,698,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $23,145,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $53,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $76,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $9,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $10,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $14,956,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,625,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,667,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,681,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,768,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,849,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $5,923,674,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of the debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $3,455,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $3,248,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $2,995,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $2,802,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,594,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,364,124,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $479,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $501,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $524,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $547,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $569,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $597,326,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $322,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $331,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $339,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $347,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $357,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $368,976,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance

Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3.438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $3,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $3,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $3,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,543,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal year 2000 (as revised) and fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $291,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $305,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $294,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $309,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $315,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $309,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $323,191,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $317,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $331,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $327,948,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $21,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $21,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $21,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $22,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,892,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $19,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,900,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,081,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$607,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $1,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $1,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $1,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$85,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,487,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $25,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,876,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $16,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,593,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,368,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,331,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $54,352,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $59,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $57,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $59,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $59,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $59,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,418,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,815,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,665,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $8,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,886,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $57,688,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $74,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $75,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $76,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $77,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $79,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,033,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $159,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $169,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $165,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $178,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $190,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $205,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $204,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $221,484,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,329,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $199,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $218,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $228,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $228,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $249,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $249,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $265,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $288,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,681,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $238,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $253,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $264,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $274,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $284,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $297,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $301,202,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,841,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $47,568,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $48,823,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $50,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $52,119,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $55,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,194,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $27,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $27,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $28,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $29,157,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $31,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $32,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,863,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,605,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,595,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,604,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $284,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,493,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $286,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $285,291,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $279,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $275,502,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $270,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,951,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$11,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$48,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$71,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$6,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$6,072,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,686,000,000.

SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE SENATE.

Not later than September 22, 2000, the Senate Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues by not more than $13,157,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and $149,761,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 201. CONGRESSIONAL LOCK BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the Social Security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the Social Security trust funds have been running surpluses for 18 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2001, the Social Security surplus will reach $166,000,000,000;

(5) in fiscal year 1999, the Federal budget was balanced without using Social Security;

(6) the only way to ensure that Social Security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets continue to be balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the Social Security trust funds.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this concurrent resolution, or any other concurrent resolution on the budget, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable.

(d) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply if—

(1) the most recent of the Department of Commerce's advance, preliminary, or final reports of actual real economic growth indicate that the rate of real economic growth for each of the most recently reported quarter and the immediately preceding quarter is less than 1 percent; or

(2) a declaration of war is in effect.

(e) SOCIAL SECURITY LOOK-BACK.—If in any fiscal year the social security surplus is used to finance general operations of the Federal Government, an amount equal to the amount used shall be deducted from the available amount of discretionary spending for the following fiscal year for purposes of any concurrent resolution on the budget.

(f) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (b) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) ALLOCATION.—In the Senate, spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation reported by the Committee on Finance to provide a prescription drug benefit for fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003, provided that this legislation will not reduce the on-budget surplus by more than $20,000,000,000 total during these 3 fiscal years, and provided that the enactment of this legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit in any of these 3 fiscal years.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The adjustments provided in subsection (a) shall be made for a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment that is offered (in the Senate), that provides coverage for prescription drugs, if the Senate Committee on Finance has not reported such legislation on or before September 1, 2000.

(c) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the Senate Committee on Finance that extends the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund without the use of transfers of new subsidies from the general fund, without decreasing beneficiaries' access to health care, and excluding the cost of extending and modifying the prescription drug benefit crafted purusuant to section (a) or (b), then the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may change committee allocations and spending aggregates by no more than $20,000,000,000 total for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 to fund the prescription drug benefit if such legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit in either of these 2 fiscal years.

(d) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—The revision of allocations and aggregates made under this section shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

SEC. 203. RESERVE FUND FOR STABILIZATION OF PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES IN SUPPORT OF EDUCATION.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides additional resources for counties and complies with paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) CONDITION.—Legislation complies with this paragraph if it provides for the stabilization of receipt-based payments to counties that support school and road systems and also provides that a portion of those payments would be dedicated toward local investments in Federal lands within the counties.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the allocations required by subsection (a) shall not exceed $200,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for fiscal year 2001 and shall not exceed $1,100,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 204. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate reports a bill on or before June 29, 2000, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides assistance for producers of program crops and specialty crops, and enhancements for agriculture conservation programs that complies with paragraph (2), the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) CONDITIONS.—Legislation complies with this paragraph if it does not cause a net increase in budget authority and outlays of greater than $1,640,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the allocations required by subsection (a) shall not exceed $5,500,000,000 in budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2000, and $3,000,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 205. TAX REDUCTION RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may reduce the spending and revenue aggregates and may revise committee allocations for legislation that reduces revenues if such legislation will not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for—

(1) fiscal year 2001; or

(2) the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 206. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL SURPLUSES.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST.—Pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office shall update its economic and budget outlook for fiscal years 2001 through 2010 by July 1, 2000.

(b) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the report provided pursuant to subsection (a) estimates an on-budget surplus for any fiscal year that exceeds the on-budget surplus set forth in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2000 economic and budget outlook, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the adjustments as provided in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the following adjustments in an amount equal to the difference between the on-budget surpluses set forth in the March report and the on-budget surplus contained in the July report:

(1) Reduce the on-budget revenue aggregate by that amount for such fiscal year.

(2) Increase the on-budget surplus levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 207 of H. Con. Res. 68 (106th Cong., 1st Sess.).

(3) Adjust the instruction in section 104 to—

(A) increase the reduction in revenues by that amount for fiscal year 2001; and

(B) increase the reduction in revenues by the sum of the amounts for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 207. MECHANISM FOR ADDITIONAL DEBT REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If any of the legislation described in subsection (b) does not become law on or before October 1, 2000, then the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall adjust the levels in this concurrent resolution as provided in subsection (c).

(b) LEGISLATION.—The adjustment required by subsection (a) shall be made with respect to—

(1) the reconciliation legislation required by section 104; or

(2) the Medicare legislation provided for in section 202.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS TO BE MADE.—The adjustment required in subsection (a) shall be—

(1) with respect to the legislation required by section 104, to decrease the balance displayed on the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard and increase the revenue aggregate by the amount set forth in section 104 (as adjusted, if adjusted, pursuant to section 205) and to decrease the level of debt held by the public as set forth in section 101(6) by that same amount; or

(2) with respect to the legislation provided for in section 202, to decrease the balance displayed on the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard by the amount set forth in section 202 and to decrease the level of debt held by the public as set forth in section 101(6) by that same amount and make the corresponding adjustments to the revenue and spending aggregates and allocations (as adjusted by section 202).

SEC. 208. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) JUSTIFICATION FOR FAILURE TO MEET CRITERIA.—If the proposed emergency requirement does not meet all the criteria set forth in paragraph (2), the committee report or the statement of managers, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the requirement should be accorded emergency status.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, a point of order may be made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure and if the Presiding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—A provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this section may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 209. RESERVE FUND PENDING INCREASE OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The functional totals with respect to discretionary spending set forth in this concurrent resolution, if implemented, would result in legislation which exceeds the limit on discretionary spending for fiscal year 2001 set out in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Nonetheless, the allocation pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations is in compliance with current law spending limits.

(2) Consequently unless and until the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 is increased, aggregate appropriations which exceed the current law limits would still be out of order in the Senate and subject to a supermajority vote.

(3) The functional totals contained in this concurrent resolution envision a level of discretionary spending for fiscal year 2001 as follows:

(A) For the discretionary category: $596,579,000,000 in new budget authority and $590,326,000,000 in outlays.

(B) For the highway category: $26,920,000,000 in outlays.

(C) For the mass transit category: $4,639,000,000 in outlays.

(4) To facilitate the Senate completing its legislative responsibilities for the 106th Congress in a timely fashion, it is imperative that the Senate consider legislation which increases the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 as soon as possible.

(b) ADJUSTMENT TO ALLOCATIONS.—Whenever a bill or joint resolution becomes law that increases the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 set out in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the appropriate Committee on Appropriations.

(c) LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT.—An adjustment made pursuant to subsection (b) shall not result in an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that exceeds the total budget authority and outlays set forth in subsection (a)(3).

SEC. 210. CONGRESSIONAL FIREWALL FOR DEFENSE AND NON-DEFENSE SPENDING.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, for fiscal year 2001 the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) for the defense category, $306,819,000,000 in new budget authority and $295,050,000,000 in outlays; and

(2) for the nondefense category, $289,760,000,000 in new budget authority and $327,583,000,000 in outlays.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the adjustment to the section 302(a) allocation to the Appropriations Committee is made pursuant to section 208 and except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that exceeds any discretionary spending limit set forth in this section.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 211. MECHANISMS FOR STRENGTHENING BUDGETARY INTEGRITY.

(a) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''budget year'' means with respect to a session of Congress, the fiscal year of the Government that starts on October 1 of the calendar year in which that session begins.

(b) POINT OF ORDER WITH RESPECT TO ADVANCED APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that—

(A) provides an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year after the budget year that is in excess of the amounts provided in paragraph (2); and

(B) provides an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year subsequent to the year after the budget year.

(2) LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS.—The total amount, provided in appropriations legislation for the budget year, of appropriations for the subsequent fiscal year shall not exceed $14,200,000,000.

(c) POINT OF ORDER WITH RESPECT TO DELAYED OBLIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that contains an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year which does not become available upon enactment of such legislation or on the first day of that fiscal year (whichever is later).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to appropriations for the following programs provided that such appropriation is not delayed beyond the specified date and does not exceed the specified amount:

(A) DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.—Operation of Indian Programs School Operation Costs (Bureau of Indian Affairs Funded Schools and Other Education Programs): July 1 not to exceed $401,000,000.

(B) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.—

(i) Training and Employment Service: July 1 not to exceed $1,650,000,000.

(ii) State Unemployment Insurance: July 1 not to exceed $902,000,000.

(C) DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.—

(i) Education Reform: July 1 not to exceed $512,000,000.

(ii) Education for the Disadvantaged: July 1 not to exceed $2,462,000,000.

(iii) School Improvement Program: July 1 not to exceed $975,000,000.

(iv) Special Education: July 1 not to exceed $2,048,000,000.

(v) Vocational Education: July 1 not to exceed $858,000,000.

(D) DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.—Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: September 30 not to exceed $343,000,000.

(E) DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Medical Care (equipment-land-structures): August 1 not to exceed $900,000,000.

(F) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.—Hazardous Substance Superfund: September 1 not to exceed $100,000,000.

(d) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsections (b) and (c) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this section may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

(f) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

(g) PRECATORY AMENDMENTS.—For purposes of interpreting section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, an amendment is not germane if it contains only precatory language.

(h) SUNSET.—Except for subsection (g), this section shall expire effective October 1, 2002.

SEC. 212. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that transfers from nonbudgetary governmental entities such as the Federal reserve banks shall not be used to offset increased on-budget spending when such transfers produce no real budgetary or economic effects.

(b) BUDGETARY RULE.—For purposes of points of order under this resolution and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, provisions contained in any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects any surplus funds of the Federal reserve banks shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues contained in such legislation.

SEC. 213. REAFFIRMING THE PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF REVENUE OFFSETS FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to reaffirm Congress' belief that the discretionary spending limits should be adhered to and not circumvented by increasing taxes.

(b) RESTATEMENT OF BUDGETARY RULE.—For purposes of points of order under this resolution and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, provisions contained in an appropriations bill (or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon) resulting in increased revenues shall continue not to be scored with respect to the level of budget authority or outlays contained in such legislation.

SEC. 214. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this concurrent resolution for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 215. RESERVE FUND TO FOSTER THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES AND THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted, that facilitates children with disabilities receiving needed health care at home and complies with paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the spending aggregate and allocation of budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) CONDITION.—Legislation complies with this paragraph if it finances health programs designed to allow children with disabilities to access the health services they need to remain at home with their families while allowing their families to become or remain employed.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the spending aggregates and allocations required by subsection (a) shall not exceed $50,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for fiscal year 2001 and shall not exceed $300,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 216. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be

considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE SENATE PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONTROLLING AND ELIMINATING THE GROWING INTERNATIONAL PROBLEM OF TUBERCULOSIS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) According to the World Health Organization—

(A) nearly 2,000,000 people worldwide die each year of tuberculosis-related illnesses;

(B) one-third of the world's total population is infected with tuberculosis; and

(C) tuberculosis is the world's leading killer of women between 15- and 44-years old and is a leading cause of children becoming orphans.

(2) Because of the ease of transmission of tuberculosis, its international persistence and growth pose a direct public health threat to those nations that had previously largely controlled the disease. This is complicated in the United States by the growth of the homeless population, the rate of incarceration, international travel, immigration, and HIV/AIDS.

(3) With nearly 40 percent of the tuberculosis cases in the United States attributable to foreign-born persons, tuberculosis will never be eliminated in the United States until it is controlled abroad.

(4) The means exist to control tuberculosis through screening, diagnosis, treatment, patient compliance, monitoring, and ongoing review of outcomes.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assumes that additional resources should be provided to fund international tuberculosis control efforts at $60,000,000 in fiscal year 2001, consistent with authorizing legislation approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in 1998, 33.2 percent of women in the labor force have children under 14;

(2) in 1998, 65.2 percent of women with children younger than age 6, and 78.4 percent of women with children ages 6 through 17 were in the labor force, and 41.6 percent of women with children younger than 3 were employed full-time;

(3) 1,920,000 couples both working and with children under 18 had family incomes of under $30,000 (10.3 percent);

(4)(A) in 1998, 11,700,000 children out of 21,300,000 (55.1 percent) under the age of 5 have employed mothers;

(B) 18.4 percent of children under 6 are cared for by their fathers at home;

(C) another 5.5 percent (562,000) are looked after by their mother either at home or away from home; and

(D) in other words, less than a quarter (23.9 percent) of these children are taken care of by 1 parent;

(5) a 1997 General Accounting Office study found that the increased work participation requirement of the welfare reform law will cause the need for child care to exceed the known supply;

(6) a 1995 study by the Urban Institute of child care prices in 6 cities found that the average cost of daycare for a 2-year-old in a child care center ranged from $3,100 to $8,100;

(7) for an entry-level worker, the family's child care costs at the average price of care for an infant in a child care center would be at least 50 percent of family income in 5 of the 6 cities examined;

(8) a large number of low- and middle-income families sacrifice a second full-time income so that a parent may be at home with the child;

(9) the average income of 2-parent families with a single income (a family with children, wife does not work) is $13,566 less than the average income of 2-parent families with 2 incomes;

(10) a recent National Institute for Child Health and Development study found that the greatest factor in the development of a young child is ''what is happening at home and in families''; and

(11) increased tax relief directed at making child care more affordable, and increased funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant, would take significant steps toward bringing quality child care within the reach of many parents, and would increase the options available to parents in deciding how best to care for their children.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume—

(1) that tax relief should be directed to parents who are struggling to afford quality child care, including those who wish to stay home to care for a child, and should be included in any tax cut package; and

(2) a total of $4,567,000,000 in funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant in fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TAX RELIEF FOR COLLEGE TUITION PAID AND FOR INTEREST PAID ON STUDENT LOANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in our increasingly competitive global economy, the attainment of a higher education is critical to the economic success of an individual, as evidenced by the fact that, in 1975, college graduates earned an average of 57 percent more than those who just finished high school, compared to 76 percent more today;

(2) the cost of attaining a higher education has outpaced both inflation and median family incomes;

(3) specifically, over the past 20 years, the cost of college tuition has quadrupled (growing faster than any consumer item, including health care and nearly twice as fast as inflation) and 8 times as fast as median household incomes;

(4) despite recent increases passed by Congress, the value of the maximum Pell Grant has declined 23 percent since 1975 in inflation-adjusted terms, forcing more students to rely on student loans to finance the cost of a higher education;

(5) from 1992 to 1998, the demand for student loans soared 82 percent and the average student loan increased 367 percent;

(6) according to the Department of Education, there is approximately $150,000,000,000 in outstanding student loan debt, and students borrowed more during the 1990's than during the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's combined; and

(7) in Congress, proposals have been made to address the rising cost of tuition and mounting student debt, including a bipartisan proposal to provide a deduction for tuition paid and a credit for interest paid on student loans.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that any tax cut package reported by the Finance Committee and passed by Congress during the fiscal year 2001 budget reconciliation process include tax relief for college tuition paid and for interest paid on student loans.

SEC. 304. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the National Institutes of Health is the Nation's foremost research center;

(2) the Nation's commitment to and investment in biomedical research has resulted in better health and an improved quality of life for all Americans;

(3) continued biomedical research funding must be ensured so that medical doctors and scientists have the security to commit to conducting long-term research studies;

(4) funding for the National Institutes of Health should continue to increase in order to prevent the cessation of biomedical research studies and the loss of medical doctors and research scientists to private research organizations; and

(5) the National Institutes of Health conducts research protocols without proprietary interests, thereby ensuring that the best health care is researched and made available to the Nation.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume increased funding in function 550 (Health) for the National Institutes of Health of $2,700,000,000, reflecting the commitment made in the fiscal year 1998 Senate Budget Resolution to double the National Institute of Health budget by 2003.

SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING FUNDING LEVELS IN EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that of the amounts provided for elementary and secondary education within the Budget Function 500 of this resolution for fiscal years 2001 through 2005, such funds shall be appropriated in proportion to and in accordance with the levels authorized in the Educational Opportunities Act, S. 2.

SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ADDITIONAL BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) In its review of government operations, the General Accounting Office noted that it was unable to determine the extent of improper government payments, due to the poor quality of agency accounting practices. In particular, the General Accounting Office cited the Government's inability to—

(A) ''properly account for and report billions of dollars of property, equipment, materials, and supplies and certain stewardship assets''; and

(B) ''properly prepare the Federal Government's financial statements, including balancing the statements, accounting for billions of dollars of transactions between governmental entities, and properly and consistently compiling the information in the financial statements.''.

(2) Private economic forecasters are currently more optimistic than the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). Blue Chip expects 2000 real GDP growth of 4.1 percent, whereas the Congressional Budget Office expects 3.3 percent growth. From 1999 through 2005, Blue Chip expects real GDP to grow more than 0.3 percentage points faster per year than the Congressional Budget Office does. Using budgetary rules of thumb, this latter difference translates into more than $150,000,000,000 over the 5-year budget window.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels contained in this resolution assume that—

(1) there are billions of dollars in wasted expenditures in the Federal Government that should be eliminated; and

(2) higher projected budget surpluses arising from reductions in government waste and stronger revenue inflows could be used in the future for additional tax relief or debt reduction.

SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REGARDING THE INADEQUACY OF THE PAYMENTS FOR SKILLED NURSING CARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Congress confronted and addressed the funding crisis for medicare beneficiaries requiring skilled nursing care through the Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999;

(2) Congress recognized the need to address the inadequacy of the prospective payment system for certain levels of care, as well as the need to end arbitrary limits on rehabilitative therapies. Congress restored $2,700,000,000 to reduce access threats to skilled care for medicare beneficiaries; and

(3) Currently, more than 1,600 skilled nursing facilities caring for more than 175,000 frail and elderly Americans have filed for bankruptcy protection.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Administration should identify areas where they have the authority to make changes to improve quality, including analyzing and fixing the labor component of the skilled nursing facility market basket update factor; and

(2) while Congress deliberates funding structural medicare reform and the addition of a prescription drug benefit, it must maintain the continued viability of the current skilled nursing benefit. Therefore, the committees of jurisdiction should ensure that medicare beneficiaries requiring skilled nursing care have access to that care and that those providers have the resources to meet the expectation for high quality care.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CARA PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that, if the Congress and the President so choose, the following programs can be fully funded as discretionary programs in fiscal year 2001, including—

(1) the Land and Water Conservation Fund programs;

(2) the Federal aid to Wildlife Fund;

(3) the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Grants;

(4) the National Historic Preservation Fund;

(5) the Payment in Lieu of Taxes; and

(6) the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON VETERAN'S MEDICAL CARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) this budget addresses concerns about Veteran's medical care;

(2) we successfully increased the appropriation for Veteran's medical care by $1,700,000,000 last year, although the President had proposed no increase in funding in his budget; and

(3) this year's budget proposes to increase the Veteran's medical care appropriation by $1,400,000,000, the level of funding in the President's budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume an increase of $1,400,000,000 in Veteran's medical care appropriations in fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON IMPACT AID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Impact Aid, as created by Congress in 1950, fulfills a Federal obligation to local educational agencies impacted by a Federal presence;

(2) the Impact Aid provides funds to these local educational agencies to help them meet the basic educational needs of all their children, particularly the needs of transient military dependent students, Native American children, and students from low-income housing projects; and

(3) the Impact Aid is funded at a level less than what is required to fully fund "all" federally connected local educational agencies.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Impact Aid Program strive to reach the goal that all local educational agencies eligible for Impact Aid receive at a minimum, 40 percent of their maximum payment under sections 8002 and 8003.

SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR INCREASED ACREAGE UNDER THE CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM AND THE WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) have been successful, voluntary, incentive-based endeavors that over the last decade and a half have turned millions of acres of marginal cropland into reserves that protect wildlife in the United States, provide meaningful income to farmers and ranchers (especially in periods of collapsed commodity prices), and combat soil and water erosion. CRP and WRP also provide increased opportunities for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities.

(2) CRP provides landowners with technical and financial assistance, including annual rental payments, in exchange for removing environmentally sensitive farmland from production and implementing conservation practices. Currently, CRP includes around 31,300,000 acres in the United States.

(3) Similarly, WRP offers technical and financial assistance to landowners who select to restore wetlands. Currently, WRP includes 785,000 acres nationwide.

(4) Furthermore, bipartisan legislation has been introduced in the 106th Congress to increase the acreage permitted under both CRP and WRP. The Administration also supports raising the acreage limitations in both programs.

(5) Unfortunately, both CRP and WRP may soon become victims of their own success and their respective statutory acreage limitations unless Congress acts. Given the popularity and demand for these conservation programs, the statutory acreage limitations will likely exhaust resources available to producers who want to participate in CRP or WRP. As currently authorized, CRP has an enrollment cap of 36,400,000 million acres and WRP is limited at 975,000 acres. As of October 1, 1999, enrollment in CRP stood at approximately 31,300,000 million acres and enrollment in WRP at just over 785,000 acres.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that Congress and the Administration should take steps to raise the acreage limits of the CRP and WRP in order to make these programs available to aid the preservation and conservation of sensitive natural soil and water resources without negatively effecting rural communities. Further, such actions should help improve farm income for agricultural producers and restore prosperity and growth to rural sectors of the United States.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TAX SIMPLIFICATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the tax code has become increasingly complex, undermining confidence in the system, and often undermining the principles of simplicity, efficiency, and equity;

(2) some have estimated that the resources required to keep records and file returns already cost American families an additional 10 percent to 20 percent over what they actually pay in income taxes; and

(3) if it is to enact a greatly simplified tax code, Congress should have a thorough understanding of the problem as well as specific proposals to consider.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Joint Committee on Taxation shall develop a report and alternative proposals on tax simplification by the end of the year, and the Department of the Treasury is requested to develop a report and alternative proposals on tax simplification by the end of the year.

SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REGARDING AGRICULTURE MERGERS AND ANTICOMPETITIVE ACTIVITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is charged with the civil and criminal enforcement of the antitrust laws, including the review of corporate mergers likely to reduce competition in particular markets, with a goal of protecting the competitive process;

(2) the Bureau of Competition of the Federal Trade Commission is also charged with enforcement of the antitrust laws, including the review of corporate mergers likely to reduce competition;

(3) the Antitrust Division and the Bureau of Competition are also responsible for the prosecution of companies and individuals who engage in anti-competitive behavior and unfair trade practices;

(4) the number of merger filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, which the Department of Justice, in conjunction with the Federal Trade Commission, is required to review, has increased significantly in fiscal years 1998 and 1999;

(5) large agri-businesses have constituted part of this trend in mergers and acquisitions;

(6) farmers and small agricultural producers are experiencing one of the worst periods of economic downturn in years;

(7) farmers currently get less than a quarter of every retail food dollar, down from nearly half of every retail food dollar in 1952;

(8) the top 4 beef packers presently control 80 percent of the market, the top 4 pork producers control 57 percent of the market, and the largest sheep processors and poultry processors control 73 percent and 55 percent of the market, respectively;

(9) the 4 largest grain processing companies presently account for approximately 62 percent of the Nation's flour milling, and the 4 largest firms control approximately 75 percent of the wet corn milling and soybean crushing industry;

(10) farmers and small, independent producers are concerned about the substantial increase in concentration in the agriculture industry and significantly diminished opportunities in the marketplace; and

(11) farmers and small, independent producers are also concerned about possible anticompetitive behavior and unfair business practices in the agriculture industry.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Antitrust Division and the Bureau of Competition will have adequate resources to enable them to meet their statutory requirements, including those related to reviewing increasingly numerous and complex

mergers and investigating and prosecuting anticompetitive business activity; and

(2) these departments will—

(A) dedicate considerable resources to matters and transactions dealing with agri-business antitrust and competition; and

(B) ensure that all vertical and horizontal mergers implicating agriculture and all complaints regarding possible anticompetitive business practices in the agriculture industry will receive extraordinary scrutiny.

SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FAIR MARKETS FOR AMERICAN FARMERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) United States agricultural producers are the most efficient and competitive in the world;

(2) United States agricultural producers are at a competitive disadvantage in the world market because the European Union outspends the United States (on a dollar/acre basis) by a ratio of 10:1 on domestic support and by a ratio of 60:1 on export subsidies;

(3) the support the European Union gives their producers results in more prosperous rural communities in Europe than in the United States;

(4) the European Union blocked consensus at the World Trade Organization ministerial meeting in Seattle because Europe does not want to surrender its current advantage in world markets;

(5) despite the competitiveness of American farmers, the European advantage has led to a declining United States share of the world market for agricultural products;

(6) the United States Department of Agriculture reports that United States export growth has lagged behind that of our major competitors, resulting in a loss of United States market share, from 24 percent in 1981 to its current level of 18 percent;

(7) the United States Department of Agriculture also reports that United States market share of global agricultural trade has eroded steadily over the past 2 decades, which could culminate in the United States losing out to the European Union as the world's top agricultural exporter sometime in 2000;

(8) prices of agricultural commodities in the United States are at 50-year lows in real terms, creating a serious economic crisis in rural America; and

(9) fundamental fairness requires that the playing field be leveled so that United States farmers are no longer at a competitive disadvantage.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the United States should take steps to increase support for American farmers in order to level the playing field for United States agricultural producers and increase the leverage of the United States in World Trade Organization negotiations on agriculture as long as such support is not trade distorting, and does not otherwise exceed or impair existing Uruguay Round obligations; and

(2) such actions should improve United States farm income and restore the prosperity of rural communities.

SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON WOMEN AND SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) without Social Security benefits, the elderly poverty rate among women would have been 52.2 percent, and among widows would have been 60.6 percent;

(2) women tend to live longer and tend to have lower lifetime earnings than men do;

(3) during their working years, women earn an average of 70 cents for every dollar men earn; and

(4) women spend an average of 11.5 years out of their careers to care for their families, and are more likely to work part-time than full-time.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) women face unique obstacles in ensuring retirement security and survivor and disability stability;

(2) Social Security plays an essential role in guaranteeing inflation-protected financial stability for women throughout their old age;

(3) the Congress and the Administration should act, as part of Social Security reform, to ensure that widows and other poor elderly women receive more adequate benefits that reduce their poverty rates and that women, under whatever approach is taken to reform Social Security, should receive no lesser a share of overall federally funded retirement benefits than they receive today; and

(4) the sacrifice that women make to care for their family should be recognized during reform of Social Security and that women should not be penalized by taking an average of 11.5 years out of their careers to care for their family.

SEC. 316. PROTECTION OF BATTERED WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Each year an estimated 1,000,000 women suffer nonfatal violence by an intimate partner.

(2) Nearly 1 out of 3 adult women can expect to experience at least 1 physical assault by a partner during adulthood.

(3) Domestic violence is statistically consistent across racial and ethnic lines. It does not discriminate based on race or economic status.

(4) The chance of being victimized by an intimate partner is 10 times greater for a woman than a man.

(5) Past and current victims of domestic violence are over-represented in the welfare population. It is estimated that at least 60 percent of current welfare beneficiaries have experienced some form of domestic violence.

(6) Abused women who do seek employment face barriers as a result of domestic violence. Welfare studies show that 15 to 50 percent of abused women report interference from their partner with education, training, or employment.

(7) The programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 have empowered communities to address the threat caused by domestic violence.

(8) Since 1995, Congress has appropriated close to $1,800,000,000 to fund programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, including the STOP program, shelters for battered women and children, the domestic violence hotline, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention injury control programs.

(9) The programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 have been and continue to comprise a successful national strategy for addressing the needs of battered women and the public health threat caused by this violence.

(10) The Supreme Court could act during this session to overturn a major protection and course of action provided for in the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. In United States v. Morrison/Brzonkala, the Supreme Court will address the issue of the constitutionality of the Federal civil rights remedy under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and may overturn congressional intent to elevate violence against women to a category protected under Federal civil rights law.

(11) The actions taken by the courts and the failure to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 has generated a great deal of concern in communities nationwide.

(12) Funding for the programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 is the only lifeline for battered women and Congress has a moral obligation to continue funding and to strengthen key components of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

(13) Congress and the Administration should work to ensure the continued funding of programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that, in light of the pending litigation challenging the constitutionality of the Federal civil rights remedy in the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 and the lack of action on legislation reauthorizing and strengthening the provisions of that Act—

(1) Congress, through reauthorization of the programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, should work to eliminate economic barriers that trap women and children in violent homes and relationships; and

(2) full funding for the programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 will be provided from the Violent Crime Reduction Fund.

SEC. 317. USE OF FALSE CLAIMS ACT IN COMBATTING MEDICARE FRAUD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the solvency of the medicare trust funds is of vital importance to the well-being of the Nation's seniors and other vulnerable people in need of quality health care;

(2) fraud against the medicare trust funds is a major problem resulting in the depletion of the trust funds; and

(3) chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the False Claims Act) and the qui tam provisions of that chapter are vital tools in combatting fraud against the medicare program.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the False Claims Act) and the qui tam provisions of that chapter are essential tools in combatting medicare fraud and should not be weakened in any way.

SEC. 318. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Army National Guard relies heavily upon thousands of full-time employees, Military Technicians and Active Guard/Reserves, to ensure unit readiness throughout the Army National Guard;

(2) these employees perform vital day-to-day functions, ranging from equipment maintenance to leadership and staff roles, that allow the drill weekends and annual active duty training of the traditional Guardsmen to be dedicated to preparation for the National Guard's warfighting and peacetime missions;

(3) when the ability to provide sufficient Active Guard/Reserves and Technicians end strength is reduced, unit readiness, as well as quality of life for soldiers and families is degraded;

(4) the Army National Guard, with agreement from the Department of Defense, requires a minimum essential requirement of 23,500 Active Guard/Reserves and 25,500 Technicians; and

(5) the fiscal year 2001 budget request for the Army National Guard provides resources sufficient for approximately 22,430 Active Guard/Reserves and 23,957 Technicians, end

strength shortfalls of 1,052 and 1,543, respectively.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.— It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in the resolution assume that the Department of Defense will give priority to funding the Active Guard/Reserves and Military Technicians at levels authorized by Congress in the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense authorization bill.

SEC. 319. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MILITARY READINESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Secretary of the Air Force stated that the United States Air Force's top unfunded readiness priority for fiscal year 2000 was its aircraft spares and repair parts account and top Air Force officers have said that getting more spares is a top priority to improve readiness rates;

(2) the Chief of Naval Operations stated that the aircraft spares and repair parts account for a top readiness priority important to the long-term health of the Navy;

(3) the General Accounting Office's study of personnel retention problems in the armed services cited shortages of spares and repair parts as a major reason why people are leaving the services;

(4) the fiscal year 2001 budget request decreases the Air Force's spares and repair parts account by 13 percent from fiscal year 2000 expected levels; and

(5) the fiscal year 2001 budget request decreases the Navy's spares and repair parts account by 6 percent from the fiscal year 2000 expected levels.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in the budget resolution assume that Congress will protect the Department of Defense's readiness accounts, including spares and repair parts, and operations and maintenance, and use the requested levels as the minimum baseline for fiscal year 2001 authorization and appropriations.

SEC. 320. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON COMPENSATION FOR THE CHINESE EMBASSY BOMBING IN BELGRADE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume funds designated to compensate the People's Republic of China for the damage inadvertently done to their embassy in Belgrade by NATO forces in May 1999, should not be appropriated from the international affairs budget.

SEC. 321. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING FUNDING OF DIGITAL OPPORTUNITY INITIATIVES.

(a) The Senate finds that—

(1) computers, the Internet, and information networks are not luxury items but basic tools largely responsible for driving the current economic expansions;

(2) information technology utility relies on software applications and online content;

(3) access to computers and the Internet and the ability to use this technology effectively is becoming increasingly important for full participation in America's economic, political, and social life; and

(4) unequal access to technology and high-tech skills by income, educational level, race, and geography could deepen and reinforce the divisions that exist within American society.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Committees on Appropriations and Finance should support efforts that address the digital divide, including tax incentives and funding to—

(1) broaden access to information technologies;

(2) provide workers and teachers with information technology training;

(3) promote innovative online content and software applications that will improve commerce, education, and quality of life; and

(4) help provide information and communications technology to underserved communities.

SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING IMMUNIZATION FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) vaccines protect children and adults against serious and potentially fatal diseases;

(2) society saves up to $24 in medical and societal costs for every dollar spent on vaccines;

(3) every day, 11,000 babies are born—4,000,000 each year—and each child needs up to 19 doses of vaccine by age 2;

(4) approximately 1,000,000 2-year-olds have not received all of the recommended vaccine doses;

(5) the immunization program under section 317(j)(1) under the Public Health Service Act, administered by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, provides grants to States and localities for critical activities including immunization registries, outbreak control, provider education, outreach efforts, and linkages with other public health and welfare services;

(6) Federal grants to States and localities for these activities have declined from $271,000,000 in 1995 to $139,000,000 in 2000;

(7) because of these funding reductions States are struggling to maintain immunization rates and have implemented severe cuts to immunization delivery activities;

(8) even with significant gains in national immunization rates, underimmunized children still exist and there are a number of subpopulations where coverage rates remain low and are actually declining;

(9) rates in many of the Nation's urban areas, including Chicago and Houston, are unacceptably low; and

(10) these pockets of need create pools of susceptible children and increase the risk of dangerous disease outbreaks.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in the resolution assume that Congress should enact legislation that provides $214,000,000 in funding for immunization grants under section 317 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b) for infrastructure and delivery activities, including targeted support for immunization project areas with low or declining immunization rates or who have subpopulations with special needs.

SEC. 323. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX CREDITS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES PROVIDING HEALTH INSURANCE TO LOW-INCOME EMPLOYEES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) 25,000,000 workers in the United States were uninsured in 1997 and more than two-thirds of the uninsured workers earn less than $20,000 annually, according to a Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation report;

(2) the percentage of employees of small businesses who have employer-sponsored health insurance coverage decreased from 52 percent in 1996 to 47 percent in 1998; for the smallest employers, those with 3 to 9 workers, the percentage of employees covered by employer-sponsored health insurance fell from 36 percent in 1996 to 31 percent in 1998;

(3) between 1996 and 1998, health premiums for small businesses increased 5.2 percent; premiums increased by 8 percent for the smallest employers, the highest increase among all small businesses;

(4) monthly family coverage for workers at firms with 3 to 9 employees cost $520 in 1998, compared to $462 for family coverage for workers at large firms; and

(5) only 39 percent of small businesses with a significant percentage of low-income employees offer employer-provided health insurance and such companies are half as likely to offer health benefits to such employees as are companies that have only a small percentage of low-income employees.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that Congress should enact legislation that allows small businesses to claim a tax credit when they provide health insurance to low-income employees.

SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) our success in the fight against crime and improvements in the administration of justice are the result of a bipartisan effort; and

(2) since 1993 the Congress and the President have increased justice funding by 92 percent, and a strong commitment to law enforcement and the administration of justice remains appropriate.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that funds to improve the justice system will be available as follows:

(1) $665,000,000 for the expanded support of direct Federal enforcement, adjudicative, and correctional-detention activities.

(2) $50,000,000 in additional funds to combat terrorism, including cyber crime.

(3) $41,000,000 in additional funds for construction costs for the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

(4) $200,000,000 in support of Customs and Immigration and Nationalization Service port of entry officers for the development and implementation of the ACE computer system designed to meet critical trade and border security needs.

(5) Funding is available for the continuation of such programs as: the Byrne Grant Program, Violence Against Women, Juvenile Accountability Block Grants, First Responder Training, Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, Weed and Seed, Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth in Sentencing, State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, Drug Courts, Residential Substance Abuse Treatment, Crime Identification Technologies, Bulletproof Vests, Counterterrorism, Interagency Law Enforcement Coordination.

SEC. 325. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE PELL GRANT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) public investment in higher education yields a return of several dollars for each dollar invested;

(2) higher education promotes economic opportunity for individuals; for example recipients of bachelor's degrees earn an average of 75 percent per year more than those with high school diplomas and experience half as much unemployment as high school graduates;

(3) access to a college education has become a hallmark of American society, and is vital to upholding our belief in equality of opportunity;

(4) for a generation, the Federal Pell Grant has served as an established and effective means of providing access to higher education;

(5) over the past decade, Pell Grant has failed to keep up with inflation. Over the past 25 years, the value of the average Pell Grant has decreased by 23 percent—it is now worth only 77 percent of what Pell Grants were worth in 1975;

(6) grant aid as a portion of student aid has fallen significantly over the past 5 years. Grant aid used to comprise 55 percent of total aid awarded and loans comprised just over 40 percent. Now that trend has been reversed so that loans comprise nearly 60 percent of total aid awarded and grants only comprise 40 percent of total aid awarded;

(7) the percentage of freshmen attending public and private 4-year institutions from families whose income is below the national median has fallen since 1981.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that within the discretionary allocation provided to the Committee on Appropriations, the funding for the maximum Pell Grant award should be at or above the level requested by the President.

SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC EDUCATION REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Recent scientific evidence demonstrates that enhancing children's physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development before the age of 6 results in tremendous benefits throughout life.

(2) Successful schools are led by well-trained, highly qualified principals, but many principals do not get the training in management skills that the principals need to ensure their school provides an excellent education for every child.

(3) Good teachers are a crucial catalyst to quality education, but 1 in 4 new teachers do not meet State certification requirements; each year more than 50,000 underprepared teachers enter the classroom; and 12 percent of new teachers have had no teacher training at all.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Federal Government should support State and local educational agencies engaged in comprehensive reform of their public education system and that any public education reform should include at least the following principles:

(1) Every child should begin school ready to learn.

(2) Training and development for principals and teachers should be a priority.

SEC. 327. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PROVIDING ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) United States international leadership is essential to maintaining security and peace for all Americans;

(2) such leadership depends on effective diplomacy as well as a strong military;

(3) effective diplomacy requires adequate resources both for operations and security of United States embassies and for international programs;

(4) in addition to building peace, prosperity, and democracy around the world, programs in the International Affairs (150) budget serve United States interests by ensuring better jobs and a higher standard of living, promoting the health of our citizens and preserving our natural environment, and protecting the rights and safety of those who travel or do business overseas;

(5) real spending for International Affairs has declined more than 40 percent since the mid-1980's, at the same time that major new challenges and opportunities have arisen from the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the worldwide trends toward democracy and free markets;

(6) current ceilings on discretionary spending will impose severe additional cuts in funding for International Affairs;

(7) improved security for United States diplomatic missions and personnel will place further strain on the International Affairs budget absent significant additional resources;

(8) the United States cannot reduce efforts to safeguard nuclear materials in the former Soviet States or shortchange initiatives aimed at maintaining stability on the Korean peninsula, where 37,000 United States forces are deployed. We cannot reduce support for peace in the Middle East or in Northern Ireland or in the Balkans. We cannot stop fighting terror or simply surrender to the spread of HIV/AIDS. We must continue to support all of these things, which are difficult to achieve without adequate and realistic funding levels; and

(9) the President's request for funds for fiscal year 2001 would adequately finance our International Affairs programs without detracting from our defense and domestic needs. It would help keep America prosperous and secure. It would enable us to leverage the contributions of allies and friends on behalf of democracy and peace. It would allow us to protect the interests of Americans who travel, study, or do business overseas. It would do all these things and more for about 1 penny of every dollar the Federal Government spends.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that additional budgetary resources should be identified for function 150 to enable successful United States international leadership.

SEC. 328. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING THE HIV/AIDS CRISIS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) More than 16,000,000 people have been killed by Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) since the epidemic began.

(2) 14,000,000 Africans have died as a result of the AIDS epidemic. Eighty-four percent of the worldwide deaths from AIDS have occurred in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Each day, AIDS kills 5,500 Africans, and infects 11,000 more.

(4) By the end of 2000, 10,400,000 children in sub-Saharan Africa will have lost one or both parents, to AIDS.

(5) Over 85 percent of the world's HIV-positive children live in Africa.

(6) Fewer than 5 percent of those living with AIDS in Africa have access to even the most basic care.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the functional totals underlying this resolution on the budget assume that Congress has recognized the catastrophic effects of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, and seeks to maximize the effectiveness of the United States' efforts to combat the disease through any necessary authorization or appropriations;

(2) Congress should strengthen ongoing programs which address education and prevention, testing, the care of AIDS orphans, and improving home and community-based care options for those living with AIDS; and

(3) Congress should seek additional or new tools to combat the epidemic, including initiatives to encourage vaccine development and programs aimed at preventing mother-to-child transmission of the disease.

SEC. 329. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TRIBAL COLLEGES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) More than 26,500 students from 250 tribes nationwide attend tribal colleges. The colleges serve students of all ages, many of whom are moving from welfare to work. The vast majority of tribal college students are first-generation college students.

(2) While annual appropriations for tribal colleges have increased modestly in recent years, core operation funding levels are still about half of the $6,000 per Indian student level authorized by the Tribally Controlled College or University Act.

(3) Although tribal colleges received a $3,000,000 increase in funding in fiscal year 2000, because of rising student populations and other factors, these institutions may face an actual per-student decrease in funding over fiscal year 1999.

(4) Per-student funding for tribal colleges is roughly half the amount given to mainstream community colleges.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Senate recognizes the funding difficulties faced by tribal colleges and assumes that priority consideration will be provided to them through funding for the Tribally Controlled College and University Act, the 1994 Land Grant Institutions, and title III of the Higher Education Act; and

(2) such priority consideration reflects Congress' intent to continue work toward current statutory Federal funding goals for the tribal colleges.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be permitted to meet on April 3, 2000, from 1 p.m.–4 p.m. in Dirksen 562 for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOHN K. RAFFERTY HAMILTON POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 474, H.R. 1374.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1374) to designate the United States Post Office Building located at 680 U.S. Highway 130 in Hamilton, New Jersey, as the ''John K. Rafferty Hamilton Post Office Building.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1374) was read a third time and passed.

JOSEPH ILETO POST OFFICE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 475, H.R. 3189.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3189) to designate the United States Post Office located at 14071 Peyton Drive in Chino Hills, California, as the ''Joseph Ileto Post Office.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3189) was read a third time and passed.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that pursuant to P.L. 105–134, the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997, the appointment of the following individual, appointed by the Minority Leader of the United States Senate, to the Amtrak Reform Council: James E. Coston of Illinois, vice Donald R. Sweitzer of Virginia.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 2000

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 4. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin consideration of the Senate Concurrent Resolution 101, the budget resolution. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will begin debate on the budget resolution at 9:30 tomorrow. Amendments are expected to be offered, debated, and voted on throughout the day and into the evening. Senators who have amendments are encouraged to work with the Budget Committee on a time to offer and debate those amendments. As previously announced, votes will occur throughout the week so that action on the budget resolution can be completed no later than Friday's session of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30. A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:04 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, April 4, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.